

Die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpâṭîm* im Buch Deuteronomium und ihre Neubegrenzung durch Dtn 12,1

Alfred Cholewiński zum Gedächtnis

Der Doppelausdruck *ḥuqqîm ûmišpâṭîm* (Einheitsübersetzung: "Gesetze und Rechtsvorschriften") ist im Buch Deuteronomium 14 mal belegt: 4,1.5.8.14.45; 5,1.31; 6,1.20; 7,11; 11,32; 12,1; 26,16.17⁽¹⁾. Innerhalb der zweiten Moserede 4,45–28,68 dient er der Rahmung von deren ersten beiden Teilen 5–11 (Geschichte und Hauptgebotsparänese) und 12–26 (Gesetze): 5,1; 11,32; 12,1; 26,16⁽²⁾. Nur an diesen 4 Stellen steht er in dem genannten Text-

⁽¹⁾ Vgl. N. LOHFINK, *Das Hauptgebot. Eine Untersuchung literarischer Einleitungsfragen zu Dt 5–11* (AnBib 20; Rom 1963) 56f. Das dort zu *ḥuqqîm ûmišpâṭîm* Ausgeführte soll im folgenden neu überdacht und weitergeführt werden.

⁽²⁾ Vgl. schon A. KLOSTERMANN, *Der Pentateuch. Neue Folge* (Leipzig 1907) 190f. Bei G. SEITZ, *Redaktionsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium* (BWANT 93; Stuttgart 1971) 23, Anm. 2, und 308, wird diese Erkenntnis zu einem Teil einer Theorie von einem "älteren Überschriftensystem" aus 4,45; 6,1 und 12,1 (23f und 35–44), das F.-L. HOSSFELD, *Der Dekalog. Seine späten Fassungen, die originale Komposition und seine Vorstufen* (OBO 45; Fribourg-Göttingen 1982) 219, Anm. 15, mir zuzuschreiben scheint — zu Unrecht. Dieses "System" ist unbewiesen. Die Begründung, an allen drei Stellen schließe sich — im Gegensatz zu dem Befund bei den "jüngeren" Überschriften — "keine besondere Redeeinleitung" an die Überschrift an, trifft für 4,45 nicht zu, vgl. 5,1 (gegen Seitz 24). Das Wortpaar *ḥuqqîm ûmišpâṭîm* ist zwar allen drei Überschriften gemeinsam, doch verbindet es sich einmal mit *ʿēdōt*, einmal mit *mišwâ*, einmal steht es allein. Das spricht kaum für die gleiche Hand. Ein "System" kann man auch deshalb nicht statuieren, weil die drei Überschriften gar nicht auf ein und derselben Sprecherebene liegen. 4,45 steht in auktorialem Text, die beiden anderen Stellen dagegen innerhalb einer zitierten Moserede. Der Unterschied der Sprecherebenen bleibt selbst dann bestehen, wenn man die Redeeinleitung in 5,1 der Schicht, zu der das "ältere Überschriftensystem" gehören soll, abspricht — denn in 4,45 wird in 3. Person über Mose gesprochen, während er die Überschriften von 6,1 und 12,1 selber spricht.

komplex isoliert. So kann kein Mißverständnis über die rahmende Funktion der 4 Belege aufkommen. In allen anderen Belegen der zweiten Moserede ist *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* Apposition zu einem anderen, voranstehenden Wort für "Gesetz" — in 4,45; 6,20 zu *'ēdōt*, in 5,31; 6,1; 7,11 zu *mišwā* — oder ist durch ein anderes, dazwischengeschobenes Wort für "Gesetz" erweitert — so in 26,17⁽³⁾.

Die Behauptung vom Appositionscharakter muß textkritisch gesichert werden. Denn bei allen Belegen gibt es Textvarianten, die zu einer Entscheidung zwingen, ob der Doppelausdruck an das vorauslaufende Wort für "Gesetz" ursprünglich syndetisch oder asyndetisch angeschlossen war. Man muß hier sicher ein zusammenhängendes textkritisches Problem sehen. Etwas vereinfacht ist die Lage so: Der samaritanische Pentateuch hat durchgehend Asyndese; die LXX hat durchgehend Syndese; der MT hat in 6,1 Asyndese, sonst Syndese. Das bringt den MT in eine Art Mittelposition. Trotzdem kann man die beiden anderen Traditionen nicht als Vereinfachungen nach je verschiedenen Seiten erklären. Weitere Beobachtungen weisen auf eine andere Sachlage hin. 1. Da im Buch Dtn und im ganzen deuteronomistischen Literaturbereich Reihenbildungen mit Wörtern für "Gesetz" fast durchgehend syndetisch konstruiert werden, sind Lesarten mit Asyndese (die den zweiten und dritten Terminus unter Umständen zur Apposition macht) *lectiones difficiliore*, ergo *praeferendae*. 2. Setzt man auch beim MT eine Tendenz zur Angleichung an die übliche Reihenbildungstechnik voraus, dann läßt sich gut erklären, warum diese Tendenz im Fall von 6,1 nicht durchdringen konnte: dort ist es nämlich durch das singularische *zō't* unmöglich gewesen, vor *ḥaḥuqqīm* ohne Verletzung des Sprachgefühls einfach ein *waw* einzufügen. Ein solches Hemmnis war an den anderen Stellen nicht vorhanden. Die LXX hat in 6,1 prompt auch pluralisches *hautai* gesetzt und sogar *mišwā* pluralisch wiedergegeben (und so den anderen Gesetzesterni angeglichen). Aus 6,1 MT geht außerdem auch eindeutig hervor, daß die asyndetische Verlängerung eines Worts für Gesetz durch *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* in der Tat als Apposition aufzufassen ist⁽⁴⁾.

⁽³⁾ Näheres unten S. 7-12.

⁽⁴⁾ Für Informationen über die Diskussion dieses textkritischen Problems bei älteren Autoren vgl. J. HEMPEL, *Die Schichten des Deuteronomiums. Ein Beitrag zur israelitischen Literatur- und Rechtsgeschichte* (Leipzig 1914) 108, Anm. 1. Richtig in jüngerer Zeit z.B. G. BRAULIK, "Die Ausdrücke für 'Gesetz' im Buch Deuteronomium", *Bib* 51 (1970) 39-66 = DERS., *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums* (SBAB 2; Stuttgart 1988) 11-38, 53, Anm. 5; S. MITTMANN, *Deuteronomium 1,1-6,3 literarkritisch und traditionsgeschichtlich untersucht* (BZAW 139; Berlin 1975) 139, Anm. 24. Dagegen ist SEITZ, *Studien*, 36, schon in der Darstellung der Beleglage unvollständig und falsch. HOSSFELD, *Dekalog*, 233f, für den die "Syndese" in Dtn 5,31 zentrale Bedeutung hat, erwähnt das textkritische Problem nicht einmal.

Auch die erweiterten Belege innerhalb der zweiten Moserede stehen alle in Überschriften, in Einzelsätzen oder an Abschnittsrändern, nicht mitten in laufendem Text⁽⁵⁾. Ganz anders ist das Bild in dem zur ersten Moserede gehörenden, sehr späten Text 4,1–40. Hier steht der unerweiterte Doppelausdruck zwar auch im Anfangssatz (4,1), aber von da an einfach im Text (4,5.8.14). Offenbar wird hier mit dem unerweiterten Ausdruck frei auf den von ihm gerahmten und so durch ihn charakteristisch bezeichneten Text 5,1–26,16 vorausgewiesen, was dem Leser aufgehen wird, wenn er zu diesem Text gelangt⁽⁶⁾.

Anders als oft zu lesen ist, scheint *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* also außer in Dtn 4,1–40 nicht eigentlich eine der für die rhetorische Sprache des Deuteronomiums frei verfügbaren und kombinierbaren Formulierungen für "Gesetz" zu sein. So erheben sich Fragen. Was bedeutet der Doppelausdruck? Wie geriet er an die Stellen, an denen er jetzt steht? Was bezeichnet er dort? Welchen besonderen Aussagen ist er dienstbar?

I. Zur Bedeutung des Wortpaares *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm*

Schon in rabbinischen Zeiten ist versucht worden, in den beiden Wörtern *ḥuqqîm* und *mišpāṭîm* zwei verschiedene Typen oder Gruppen von Rechtsformulierungen zu sehen⁽⁷⁾. Auf diese Idee kann man

⁽⁵⁾ Etwas zu einfach D. KNAPP, *Deuteronomium 4. Literarische Analyse und theologische Interpretation* (GTA 35; Göttingen 1987) 43: "Dieses Wortpaar steht nur an inner-deuteronomischen Grenzstellen". Oder meint K. vielleicht nur die Stellen, wo das Wortpaar ohne Verbindung mit anderen Wörtern für "Gesetz" auftritt?

⁽⁶⁾ Vgl. BRAULIK, "Ausdrücke", 47. Die Frage von KNAPP, *Deuteronomium* 4, 43f, ob die Verwendung von *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* in 4,1–40 als "Leitwort" (was mir nicht zuzutreffen scheint, nimmt man den Terminus genau) nicht anzeige, daß "dieser Abschnitt als ganzer eine Grenzstelle markieren will", ist, da strukturanzeigende Signalsysteme für den Leser progressiv aufgebaut werden müssen, um überhaupt zu existieren, abwegig. Ganz aus der von Dtn 5–26 her ja synchron zu verstehenden Frage nach einer Abgrenzungsfunktion des Abschnitts springt dann die diachrone Wendung dieser Frage in der beigegeführten Anmerkung 231 heraus, nach der durch 4,1–40 "Dtn 1–3 DtrH (plur.) von dem um Dtn 5 erweiterten Dt (sing. Paränese und Gesetz)" getrennt würde.

⁽⁷⁾ Ältestes Zeugnis ist *Sifre Dtn* § 59 (FINKELSTEIN 125; zu Dtn 12,1). Hier werden die *ḥuqqîm* als *mīdrāšôt* (= halakische Auslegungen biblischen

besonders von Dtn 12,1 her kommen, wo der Doppelausdruck in der Überschrift zu den eigentlichen Gesetzen steht⁽⁸⁾. Doch ist es noch niemandem gelungen, eine entsprechende These mit auch nur einigermaßen überzeugenden Argumenten — sei es von Etymologie und Bedeutung der beiden Wörter *ḥōq* und *mišpāṭ*, sei es von den Kontexten des pluralischen Doppelausdrucks her — zu begründen⁽⁹⁾.

Ich könnte mir überhaupt nur einen einzigen dt Beleg vorstellen, bei dem eine vage Hoffnung bestünde, nachweisen zu können, daß die beiden Wörter *ḥuqqim* und *mišpāṭim* je verschiedene Gesetzesgruppen oder -typen meinen: Dtn 26,16. Denn hier läuft der Text so verzögernd-holprig, daß man auf den Gedanken kommen könnte, *w'et hammišpāṭim* sei nachträglich hinzugefügt worden — und das vielleicht im Zusammenhang mit der Einfügung neuartiger Gesetze in die vorausgehende Sammlung. Oder zumindest könnte man von dieser Stelle aus argumentieren, in *ḥuqqim ūmišpāṭim* liege gar kein echter Doppelausdruck vor, vielmehr stehe jedes der beiden Wörter für sich und bezeichne (falls es sich nicht um Synonyme handelt) eine je eigene Größe. Beide Überlegungen kann man sicher nicht hundertprozentig ausscheiden. Aber im allgemeinen haben sich im Dtn hinzufügende Hände dem in ihrer Vorgabe herrschenden Sprachduktus recht gut angepaßt. Mir scheint es hier,

Rechts) und die *mišpāṭim* als *dīnīm* (= logische Schlüsse im Sinne der 7 Mid-dot von R. Hillel o.ä.) erklärt. Für rabbinisches Denken dürfte es grundsätzlich unmöglich gewesen sein, zwei verschiedene Wörter in der Schrift als synonym zu betrachten.

⁽⁸⁾ Einflußreichster neuerer Deutungsversuch dieses Typs bei F. HORST, *Das Privilegrecht Jahwes. Rechtsgeschichtliche Studien zum Deuteronomium* (FRLANT 45; Göttingen 1930) 120: "Das Deuteronomium behauptet selbst, Rechtsmaterial doppelter Art zu enthalten: *ḥuqqim* und *mišpāṭim*". Zunächst werde das "Privilegrecht Jahwes" behandelt (*ḥuqqim*), dann folgten "Bestimmungen zivilrechtlicher Art" (*mišpāṭim*). R. HENTSCHE, *Satzung und Setzender. Ein Beitrag zur israelitischen Rechtsterminologie* (BWANT 83; Stuttgart 1963) 73, löste sich von Horsts spezieller Theorie vom "Privilegrecht" und ordnete die beiden Wörter den Kultvorschriften und dem Zivilrecht zu. G. LIECKE, *Gestalt und Bezeichnung alttestamentlicher Rechtssätze. Eine formgeschichtlich-terminologische Studie* (WMANT 39; Neukirchen-Vluyn 1971) 200, versuchte, in den beiden Wörtern, je für sich genommen, die von A. Alt eingeführte Unterscheidung von apodiktischem und kasuistischem Rechtssatz wiederzufinden.

⁽⁹⁾ Meine Gegenthese: *Hauptgebot*, 56f. Sie war allerdings wohl zu radikal. Ich würde jetzt nicht mehr vertreten, "jedes Wort und jede Wortkombination" für "Gesetz" tendiere im Dtn dahin, "die Gesamtheit des Dt zu meinen, oder auch jeden beliebigen Teil" (54). Hiergegen mit Recht BRAULIK, "Ausdrücke". Ich halte auch nicht mehr meine Behauptung aufrecht, bei *ḥuqqim ūmišpāṭim* sei ein spezieller Bezug zu Dtn 12-26 unbeweisbar (57).

am Höhepunkt des ganzen Buches (unmittelbar vor 26,17–19), wahrscheinlicher zu sein, daß der vorher schon festeingeführte und daher wohlbekannte Doppelausdruck bewußt rhetorisch zerdehnt wird. Vielleicht wird auch schon vorbereitet, daß im folgenden Vers das Wort *hammišwôt* zwischen seine beiden Glieder eingeschoben werden soll. Mit all dem ist er aber gerade als Doppelausdruck vorausgesetzt, und man kann aus dem stilistischen Phänomen keine semantische Folgerung ziehen.

Eine Klärung der Bedeutung scheint jedoch von der singularischen Gestalt des Doppelausdrucks her möglich zu sein (*ḥōq ûmišpāṭ*). Sie ist zwar nur viermal belegt (Ex 15,25; Jos 24,25; 1 Sam 30,25; Esr 7,10), aber mindestens einmal vordeuteronomisch, nämlich in 1 Sam 30,25. Genau in diesem Beleg bezeichnet der Doppelausdruck eindeutig eine einzige rechtliche Bestimmung. Es geht um eine durch David nach einem Streit neu eingeführte und später in Israel allgemein geltende Verordnung über die Verteilung von Kriegsbeute. Wenn der Doppelausdruck also nur eine einzige Bestimmung bezeichnet, muß das zweite Wort (falls es nicht schlicht als synonym-pleonastisch zu betrachten ist) eine Näherbestimmung des ersten enthalten. Es kann nicht additiv, es muß qualifizierend sein. Man könnte etwa sagen: Eine Rechtsbestimmung (*ḥōq*), und zwar (*û*) eine, die auf eine in einer noch offenen oder unklaren Situation getroffene Entscheidung einer Autorität zurückgeht (*mišpāṭ*)⁽¹⁰⁾.

Falls in Ex 15,25 und Jos 24,25 alte Traditionen zu Wort kommen, könnte auch dort ursprünglich eine einzige Rechtsklärung durch Mose oder Josua gemeint gewesen sein. Interessant ist auch die (syntaktisch anders gebaute) Ergänzung von *ḥuqqâ* durch *mišpāṭ* in Num 27,11, der Unterschrift zu 27,8–11. Denn diese von da an in Israel geltende erbrechtliche Regelung wird vorher (27,1–7) narrativ ausdrücklich als göttliche Entscheidung zur Klärung ei-

⁽¹⁰⁾ Zur Möglichkeit eines derartigen Funktionierens von Doppelausdrücken vgl. vor allem D. MICHEL, "‘Ămât. Untersuchung über "Wahrheit" im Hebräischen", *ABG* 12 (1968) 30–57. Für *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* im Dtn vgl. G. BRAULIK, *Deuteronomium 1–16,17* (NEB 15; Würzburg 1986) 42 (zu Dtn 4,14). Für *ḥōq ûmišpāṭ* in Ex 15,25 rechnet H. M. ORLINSKY, *Notes on the New Translation of the Torah* (New York 1969) 171, mit einem Hendiadyoin, wenn auch mit etwas anderer Bedeutung. — Ich habe bei der im Text gegebenen Interpretation von *mišpāṭ* von "Autorität" gesprochen und eine Eingrenzung auf "Gerichtsentscheidung" vermieden, weil die in Frage kommenden Belege eigentlich eher auf einen weiteren Bedeutungsumfang von *mišpāṭ* weisen.

ner vorhandenen Rechtsunklarheit, wenn nicht eines Rechtsstreits charakterisiert (vgl. 7: *kēn b'nōt šelophād dōb'rōt*). Vermutlich ist auch die in Num 35,9-29 vorliegende konkretisierte Blutracheregelung, wo in der Unterschrift 35,29 der Ausdruck *huqqat mišpāt* wiederkehrt, als eine bisher Unklares entscheidende gesetzliche Neuordnung zu verstehen. Beide Belege finden sich vielleicht nicht zufällig im Nachtragsbereich des späten pentateuchischen Rechts.

Im folgenden werde ich mit der hier entwickelten Grundbedeutung des Doppelausdrucks arbeiten. Seine pluralische Gestalt gibt an, daß es sich um eine Mehrheit von derartigen Rechtsbestimmungen handelt. Von jeder einzelnen gilt beides: die im Wort *hōq* gemachte Genusangabe und die im Wort *mišpāt* gemachte spezifische Qualifizierung durch den Ursprung in einer Entscheidung einer Autorität.

II. Zur Geschichte des Wortpaares *huqqīm ūmišpāīm* im Rahmen der Entstehungsgeschichte des Dtn-Textes

Die Rahmungsfunktion des Doppelausdrucks für Dtn 5,1-26,16 wird, wie schon gesagt, durch die anderen Belege in diesem Textbereich bei synchroner Lektüre nicht beeinträchtigt, ja sogar unterstrichen, weil in den anderen Belegen der Doppelausdruck stets als Apposition auf ein anderes Wort für "Gesetz" (*mišwā* oder *'ēdōt*) folgt (oder im angrenzenden Fall von 26,17 durch ein dazwischengeschobenes Wort aufgesprengt ist). Dieser Sachverhalt kann nicht auf Zufall beruhen, muß also diachron verständlich gemacht werden können.

Eine erste, naheliegende Hypothese erklärt leider nicht alle Sachverhalte. Nach ihr hätte das dt Gesetz schon früh verschiedenste Ausdrücke für "Gesetz" verwendet und aus ihnen Reihen gebildet. Als man es später literarisch rahmte, hätte man deshalb eine neue, diesen Rahmen allein kennzeichnende Wörterkombination gesucht und aus dem Fundus vorhandener und noch nicht ausgenutzter Sprachmöglichkeiten den Doppelausdruck *huqqīm ūmišpāīm* gewählt. Bei nochmals späteren Bearbeitungen des von diesem Doppelausdruck umrahmten Textes hätte man dann aber auch innerhalb dieses Textes auf ihn zurückgegriffen. Dabei hätte man jedoch darauf geachtet, daß an der betreffenden Stelle stets auch noch ein anderes Wort vorkam, so daß der Rahmen des Gesamttextes weiterhin an seiner exklusiven Terminologie erkenntlich blieb.

Diese Hypothese erklärt eine Reihe von Fakten nicht. Nämlich 1., daß auch die Überschrift des ganzen Textbereichs in 4,45 aus drei Termini besteht — denn hier, bei einer Textankündigung, hätte man ja — ähnlich wie es später in 4,1-40 geschah — sinnvollerweise die genaue Terminologie des Rahmenwerks von 5-26 verwenden können; 2., daß keine normalen "Reihen" vorliegen, wie sie sonst im Dtn üblich sind⁽¹¹⁾, mit *Waw* zwischen allen Einzelgliedern, sondern Gebilde, die aus einem Terminus für "Gesetze" bestehen, an den der Ausdruck *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* als Apposition angefügt ist; 3., daß die Belege dieses Typs von "Reihen" nach 7,11 zu Ende sind und sich nicht über den Gesamttext verteilen.

Die folgende Hypothese erklärt auch diese Sachverhalte. Ihr entscheidender Punkt ist: Nicht das Rahmungssystem stand zeitlich am Anfang, sondern die komplizierteren Belege in 5,31 und 6,1, in denen *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* zu *mišwâ* als Apposition hinzutritt. Als Dtn 5 vorgebaut wurde, wäre der Doppelausdruck, der bis dahin im deuteronomischen Text noch nicht vorhanden war, an diesen Stellen gerade wegen seiner oben aus 1 Sam 30,25 erarbeiteten Bedeutung eingeführt worden. Durch ihn wurde die in Dtn 5 gemachte Aussage des deuteronomischen Gesetzes über sich selbst gewissermaßen "auf den Begriff gebracht". Erst sekundär und in Anlehnung an diese beiden Stellen wäre der Doppelausdruck dann, und zwar, wie bis dahin nirgends, selbständig, nicht mehr als Apposition, bei der Schaffung eines Rahmungssystems für den Gesamttext Dtn 5-26 verwendet worden. Von dort aus hätte sich später Dtn 4 inspiriert.

Dtn 5 entfaltet nämlich, zunächst narrativ, eine Globaltheorie über das Wesen der deuteronomischen Gesetzgebung. Zumindest von 5,22 ab, wo gesagt wird, außer dem Dekalog habe Jahwe aus Feuer, Wolken und Dunkel mit lauter Stimme zur ganzen Versammlung nichts anderes mehr proklamiert (*lō' yāsāp*), ist, da man sich ja im Bereich eines viel umfassenderen Gesetzbuches befindet, die Frage aufgeworfen, wie dieses sich denn nun zu dem Dekalog vom Horeb verhalte. Die damit erzeugte narrative Spannung treibt die Erzählung weiter voran. Sie findet ihre narrative Lösung erst in 5,29 und 31, wo alles auch sofort theoretisch formuliert wird. Nach der auf diese Weise entwickelten Theorie ist die deuteronomische Gesetzgebung

⁽¹¹⁾ Vgl. LOHFINK, *Hauptgebot*, 54-58; M. WEINFELD, *Deuteronomy and the Deuteronomistic School* (Oxford 1972) 332-338.

eine nähere, Israel durch Mose vermittelte Determinierung der verschiedenen, von der am Horeb gegebenen dekalogischen Grundordnung her noch recht offenen Rechtsbereiche⁽¹²⁾.

Warum in 5,31 gerade das Wortpaar *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* verwendet wird, ist dann verständlich, wenn man seine oben erarbeitete Bedeutung voraussetzt. Wegen dieser Bedeutung könnte der zur Zeit der Abfassung und Einfügung von Dtn 5 in deuteronomischen Texten noch nicht vorkommende Ausdruck *ḥōq ūmišpāṭ* in pluralistischer Gestalt als besonders passende Charakterisierung empfunden worden sein – vor allem, wenn sich (neben der offiziellen, auf Theonomie hinauslaufenden Theorie von Dtn 5) gleichzeitig auch noch ein Wissen erhalten hatte, daß viele Bestimmungen des deuteronomischen Gesetzes faktisch im Lauf der Geschichte durch Autoritäten oder Richter eingeführt worden waren, um vorher unklare rechtliche Situationen rechtlich eindeutig zu machen (daß sie also *ḥōq ūmišpāṭ* im üblichen Sinne waren). Wenn sie jetzt im Deuteronomium Gottesrecht sind, dann doch in einer analogen Struktur. Dtn 5,31 wäre also die Stelle im deuteronomischen Text, wo das Wortpaar durchaus sachgemäß und kreativ in die deuteronomische Sprache eingebracht wurde, ähnlich wie auch das Wortspiel *kol hammišwōt* – *kol hammišwā*.

Im einzelnen: In Dtn 5,28f drückt Jahwe den Wunsch aus, das Volk möge doch immerdar in Furcht vor ihm verharren und den ganzen Dekalog beobachten: *'et kol mišwōtay*⁽¹³⁾. Dann gibt er Mose den Auftrag, das Volk zu entlassen und allein zurückzukehren (5,30f). Ist das geschehen, will er Mose "das ganze Gebot" mitteilen: *'et kol hammišwā*⁽¹⁴⁾. Ergänzend neben die *mišwōt* tritt also – im Kollektiv-Singular – die *mišwā*. Daß diese eine Ergänzungs- und

⁽¹²⁾ Vgl. zuletzt G. BRAULIK, "Die Abfolge der Gesetze in Dtn 12–26 und der Dekalog", *Das Deuteronomium* (Hrsg. N. LOHFINK) (BETL 68; Löwen 1985) 252–272 = ders., *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums* (SBAB 2; Stuttgart 1988) 231–255, 252.

⁽¹³⁾ Zu *hammišwōt* als Bezeichnung des Dekalogs in Dtn 5,10.29; 6,17; 7,9; 8,2; 13,5 vgl. BRAULIK, "Ausdrücke", 56.

⁽¹⁴⁾ Hierzu *ebd.* 53–56. Vielleicht ist *kol hammišwā* mit Referenz auf das gesamte Gesetz an dieser Stelle erstmalig eingeführt worden. So HOSSFELD, *Dekalog*, 233 – allerdings mit von mir nicht geteilten literarkritischen Annahmen. Ebenso ist wohl in 5,29 *hammišwōt* erstmalig als Bezeichnung des Dekalogs gebraucht worden. Hier wurde offenbar aufeinander abgestimmte Terminologie geschaffen.

Klärungsfunktion bezüglich vieler von den *mišwôt* her noch offenen Fragen haben soll, wird nun gerade dadurch ausgedrückt, daß in Apposition zu *mišwâ* unser Ausdruck *ḥaḥuqqîm wʿhammišpāṭîm* hinzugefügt wird. Dieser Ausdruck determiniert die *mišwâ* im Sinne einer autoritativ gesetzten Sammlung von Rechtsbestimmungen (*ḥuqqîm*), die das vom Dekalog her offen Bleibende klärt (*mišpāṭîm*). Die rechtsetzende Autorität ist natürlich Jahwe selbst, wenn auch durch Mose vermittelt (und nach dem — wohl späteren — Prophetengesetz weiter durch "den Propheten" mittelbar).

Mit 5,31 ist der Bericht über das Horebgeschehen zu Ende. Mose verläßt die narrative Sprechhaltung und wendet sich seinen Zuhörern in Moab jetzt ermahrend zu. Er ermahnt sie in 5,32-33 zunächst, den Weg des Dekalogs zu gehen⁽¹⁵⁾. Dann kommt er zu der ihm zugeteilten Aufgabe, der Proklamation der *mišwâ*. Er beginnt in 6,1 mit einer Art Überschrift, in der er die Formulierung Jahwes aus 5,31 — *hammišwâ ḥaḥuqqîm wʿhammišpāṭîm* — unverändert aufgreift. Das ist wichtig, denn er ist nur treuer Vermittler. Erst in der Verlängerung der Überschrift in 6,2 wird der Sprachgebrauch umfassender, und weitere, offenbar schon vorgegebene Termini für "Gesetz" treten auf.

Die Weiterführung der Aussagen von 6,1 in 6,2a ist nicht reine Redundanz, und insofern ist die Annahme einer ergänzenden Hand zwar nicht ausschließbar, aber doch auch wieder nicht so sicher, wie sie bei manchen rein wortstatistisch arbeitenden Literarkritikern auftritt. Die Frage muß aber in diesem Zusammenhang nicht entschieden werden. Jedenfalls laufen auf der Ebene stilistischer Gestaltung jetzt Motivabfolgen aus dem Schlußteil von Kapitel 5 palindromisch wieder zurück: 6,1 hatte schon 5,31 anklingen lassen, 6,2 läßt 5,29 anklingen, 6,3 schließlich 5,27⁽¹⁶⁾. Aber inhaltlich werden auch weitere Aspekte eingeführt. Das in 6,2a durch die palindromische Bewegung anklingende Dekalogthema wird mit dem Gesetzesthema verbunden: der Dekalogterminus aus 5,29 bildet eine Reihe mit *ḥaḥuqqôt*, sonst einem Gesetzeterminus, so daß *mišwôtāyw* hier zwar alle Gesetze, nicht nur den Dekalog meint, auf diesen aber dennoch mitanspielt. Der Bezug zwischen den *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* und dem Dekalog wird auf diese Weise noch einmal herausgestellt. Der Autorität Jahwes (*šiwwâ* 6,1) tritt die vermittelnde Autorität Moses (*mʿsawwekā* 6,2) zur Seite. Zur Angabe des Raums, in dem die Gesetze gelebt werden können (6,1: das zu erobernde Land) tritt die Angabe der Geltungs-

⁽¹⁵⁾ Zu *derek* an dieser Stelle als Bezeichnung des Dekalogs vgl. BRAULIK, "Ausdrücke", 51.

⁽¹⁶⁾ Vgl. hierzu LOHFINK, *Hauptgebot*, 66-68 und 150f; SEITZ, *Studien*, 41.

dauer (6,2: das ganze Leben) und des dem Gesetz direkt unterworfenen Personenkreises (6,2: die ganze Großfamilie, nicht nur der Familienvater)⁽¹⁷⁾.

Die ursprüngliche Formulierung für das deuteronomische Gesetz aus der Jahwerede 5,31 wird, wenn auch abgewandelt, wieder in der aufs Grundsätzliche zurücklenkenden Kinderfrage von 6,20 aufgenommen: *hā'ēdōt haḥuqqīm wəhammišpāṭīm*. An die Stelle von *hammišwā* tritt hier *hā'ēdōt*. Daß die beiden Wörter als äquivalent gelten sollen, ergibt sich aus dem Ausdruck *kol hammišwā hazzō't* an der Entsprechungsstelle der väterlichen Antwort in 6,25⁽¹⁸⁾. Darüber, warum hier und in 4,45 *'ēdōt*, und nicht *mišwā*, steht, läßt sich eine wohlbegründete Vermutung anstellen, die ich jedoch, da dafür textkritische Fragen im Bereich der Königsbücher und der Chronik aufgeworfen werden müssen, in einer gesonderten Publikation vorlegen möchte⁽¹⁹⁾: *'ēdōt* dürfte schon zur Terminologie der joschijanischen Urkunde gehört haben, wurde in der deuteronomistischen Sprachfixierung aber aus uns unbekannten Gründen aufgegeben. Im Grundbestand von 6,20 war es aber vorgegeben und konnte (und sollte wohl auch) bei der Fortschreibung des Textes nicht umgangen werden. Für die jetzt hier vorzunehmende Analyse genügt die von 6,25 her gemachte Feststellung, daß in 6,20 (und entsprechend in 4,45) *'ēdōt* gleichbedeutend mit *mišwā* ist. Daß auf der hier untersuchten Stufe des dtn Textes verschiedene Termini für die gleiche Sache schon nebeneinandertreten konnten, hat bereits 6,2a gezeigt: auch dort war schon eine andere Terminologie neben die von 6,1 gesetzt worden.

Die gleiche Formulierung wie in 6,20 findet sich in der Überschrift in Dtn 4,45. Innerhalb der im jetzigen Text höchst verwickelten Überschrift 4,44-49 scheint 4,45 den ursprünglichen Kern zu enthalten⁽²⁰⁾. 4,44 gehört zu dem zweifellos späten umfassenden Über-

(17) Hierzu vgl. BRAULIK, *Deuteronomium 1-16*, 17, 54f.

(18) Vgl. BRAULIK, "Ausdrücke", 64: "Es ist interessant, daß die unechte Reihe *hā'ēdōt haḥuqqīm wəhammišpāṭīm* in 6,20 in V. 24 durch *kol-haḥuqqīm* und in V. 25 durch *kol-hammišwā* aufgenommen wird".

(19) "Textkritisches und Traditionsgeschichtliches zu 'dwt in 2 Kön 23,3 und im Buch Dtn".

(20) Anders HOSSFELD, *Dekalog*, 218, Anm. 14. Er datiert 4,45 (ebenso wie 4,44) allein wegen der Bezeichnung *b'nē yiśrā'ēl* ganz spät. Daß *b'nē yiśrā'ēl* im innerdeuteronomischen Bereich sonst kaum vorkommt, hängt aber damit zusammen, daß im Dtn in narrativer Sprache, speziell auch bei Kon-

schriftensystem des Buches⁽²¹⁾. Der älteste Bestand des Restbereichs muß in 4,45 stecken, weil nur so eine wirkliche Überschrift gesichert ist. Die höchst ungenaue, noch keine Idee von einem Moabbund verratende Historisierung der Gesetzesstiftung (*bəṣē'tām mim-miṣrāyim*), die später von deuteronomistischen Händen in 4,46-49 konkretisiert werden mußte, zunächst durch einen Zusatz mit satzabschließender Wiederholung des Stichworts am Ende von 4,46, später durch daran nochmals angehängten Text, könnte sehr gut schon in der Überschrift des joschijanischen Dokuments gestanden haben und ebendeshalb nicht austauschbar, sondern nur erweiterbar gewesen sein. Der Terminus für "Gesetz" dürfte darin 'ēdōt gewesen sein. Die Überschrift hätte also ursprünglich gelautet: 'ēlleh hā'ēdōt 'āšer dibber Mošeh 'el b'nē Yiśrā'el bəṣē'tām mimmiṣrāyim. In dem Augenblick, als die Apposition *haḥuqqîm wəhammišpāṭîm* in 5,31; 6,1.20 in den Text kam, oder auch zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt, wäre sie auch hier zu hā'ēdōt hinzugesetzt worden, weil die Überschrift ja den Formulierungen im dann folgenden Text einigermaßen entsprechen sollte.

In der Mitte von Kapitel 7 wird im Zusammenhang mit einer Reinterpretation einer wichtigen Dekalogspassage (7,9f vgl. 5,9f) nochmals die ursprüngliche Wörterkombination *hammišwā haḥuqqîm wəhammišpāṭîm* gebraucht: 7,11. Wieder ist zunächst — im Anschluß an Vaterschwur und Befreiung aus Ägypten (7,8) — von der Reaktion Jahwes auf die Beobachtung des Dekalogs durch Israel die Rede (7,9 *mišwōtāw*). Dies ist eher noch etwas, was zu Israels Wissen

vokationsberichten für Israel, und in legislativen Texten bei den dort behandelten Materien eine andere Terminologie für "Israel" teilweise gefordert war, teilweise bewußt gepflegt wurde. Daraus folgt aber nichts für Überschriften, und *b'nē yiśrā'el* wird dadurch erst recht nicht zu einem im 7. Jahrhundert undenkbaren Terminus.

(21) Vgl. P. KLEINERT, *Das Deuteronomium und der Deuteronomiker. Untersuchungen zur alttestamentlichen Rechts- und Literaturgeschichte* (Bielefeld-Leipzig 1872) 167; N. LOHFINK, "Der Bundesschluß im Land Moab. Redaktionsgeschichtliches zu Dt 28,69-32,47", *BZ* 6 (1962) 32-56, 32-34; SEITZ, *Studien*, 24-27; vgl. auch KNAPP, *Deuteronomium* 4, 121-127, dessen Beurteilung von 4,45 ich aber nicht teile. Er erklärt z.B. nicht die Wiederholung von *bəṣē'tām mimmiṣrāyim* in 4,46, und eine Schichtenzuteilung einfach nur aufgrund von Vokabelhäufigkeitsstatistik halte ich hier nicht für möglich. MITTMANN, *Deuteronomium* 1,1-6,3, 129, entwickelt unter Nichterwähnung der ganzen Überschriftendiskussion zum Dtn von einer einzigen Beobachtung aus die Annahme, 4,44 enthalte die ältere Überschrift.

gehört (7,9 *wəjāda'tā*), während dann die jetzt akute Handlungsaufforderung (7,11 *wəšāmarā*) sich auf die Gesamtheit der Gesetze bezieht (7,11 *'et hammišwā*), die den Charakter autoritativer Klärung der vom Dekalog her noch offenen Handlungsfelder hat (7,11 *'et haḥuqqīm wə't hammišpāṭīm*). Diese Gesetze werden jetzt von Mose promulgiert (7,11b). Hier schließt sich an die Beobachtung durch Israel von seiten Jahwes die Fülle des Segens an, gewissermaßen eine Vorwegnahme des Segens aus Dtn 28, am Ende der Gesetze (7,12ff), wobei die vorangehende Gesetzeterminologie durch deren letztes Wort aufgegriffen wird: *hammišpāṭīm hā'ēlleh* (7,12a).

Das ist das letzte Vorkommen der Kombination *hammišwā haḥuqqīm wəhammišpāṭīm* im Buch. Vielleicht galt von da an (oder, falls dieser Textbereich jünger ist, sogar schon einmal von 6,20 an) die durch die Apposition beabsichtigte Aussage über die Beziehung von Dekalog und deuteronomischem Gesetz als hinreichend eingehämmert. Jedenfalls treten von jetzt an im deuteronomischen Text *hammišwā* ebenso wie andere Bezeichnungen für "Gesetz" nicht mehr mit einer Erweiterung durch diese Apposition auf.

Galt es also, mithilfe des Doppelausdrucks *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* die in Dtn 5 dargelegte Theorie auf den Begriff zu bringen, dann ist verständlich, warum *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* 1. nicht in normalgebildeten Reihen für "Gesetz" erscheint, sondern stets als Apposition zu einem anderen Wort für die deuteronomischen Gesetze, und warum 2. dieser Gebrauch des Doppelausdrucks nach 7,11 nicht mehr vorkommt. Ferner ist impliziert, daß in diesem Stadium der Textwerdung das Wortpaar *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* keine übliche Gesamtbezeichnung für das deuteronomische Gesetz darstellte. Daher kann auch, zumindest als die Grundstellen 5,31 und 6,1 formuliert wurden, das mit Hilfe des Doppelausdrucks gebildete Rahmensystem 5,1; 11,32; 12,1; 26,16 noch nicht vorgegeben gewesen sein. Daß dieses nicht am Anfang der Geschichte der Selbstbezeichnungen des Deuteronomiums steht, erklärt auch, warum in der ältesten Überschrift (in 4,45) offenbar nicht die sonst doch zu erwartende Terminologie dieses Rahmens, sondern ein anderes Wort (*'ēdōt*) gestanden hat, das später im deuteronomistischen Bereich praktisch keine Rolle mehr spielte.

Bei der Herstellung des Rahmensystems mußte als Erkennungssignal der rahmenden Verse eine Bezeichnung der "Gesetze" gewählt werden, die im Text so noch nicht vorkam — sonst wäre ja keine Signalwirkung zustande gekommen. Da bot sich offenbar der nirgends im Text isoliert stehende Doppelausdruck *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* an,

wenn man ihn nur von den ihn als Apposition tragenden Wörtern loskoppelte. Daraus folgt, daß das Rahmensystem frühestens vom Verfasser von 5,31; 6,1 hergestellt sein kann, nichts jedoch gegen eine noch spätere Herstellung spricht. Dtn 26,17 setzt das Rahmensystem voraus oder gehört frühestens der gleichen Hand an. Hier wird der Leitterminus des Rahmensystems mit dem Leitterminus der Segens- und Fluchtexte von Dtn 28 (*mišwôt*) verschränkt⁽²²⁾.

Durch die Verwendung im Rahmensystem konnte der Doppelausdruck *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* in der Folge natürlich doch als eine normale Bezeichnung der deuteronomischen Gesetze empfunden werden und neben die anderen dafür schon vorhandenen Ausdrücke und Ausdruckskombinationen treten. Das wirkte sich außerhalb von Dtn 5–26 in späteren deuteronomistischen Texten aus.

Innerhalb des Buches Dtn ist dafür nur ein einziger Text zu nennen: 4,1–40. Dort steht der Ausdruck viermal: 4,1.5.8.14⁽²³⁾. Zwar kommen auch mehrere andere Termini vor, aber dieser Ausdruck ist nicht nur am häufigsten, sondern offenbar auch der eigentlich kennzeichnende⁽²⁴⁾. Interessant ist die Akzentverschiebung in 4,14 gegenüber 5,31. In 5,31 erhält Mose auf dem Horeb die Gesetze von Jahwe mitgeteilt, in 4,14 erhält er nur einen Befehl, das Volk später *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* (kein Artikel!) zu lehren. Was das für die in 4,1–40 implizierte Theorie des dtn Gesetzes bedeutet, kann hier nicht weiter entfaltet werden.

⁽²²⁾ Vgl. N. LOHFINK, "Dt 26,17–19 und die 'Bundesformel'", ZKT 91 (1969) 517–553, 542.

⁽²³⁾ Außerdem dürfte in 4,6.40 *ḥuqqîm* verkürzte Aufnahme des vollen Ausdrucks sein. Für 4,6 vgl. den Kontext, für 4,40 die folgende Anmerkung.

⁽²⁴⁾ *haddābār* in 4,2 (hier wohl im Sinne von "Text"); *mišwôt YHWH* in 4,2.20; *hattôrâ hazzô't* in 4,8. Wenn in 4,40 *ḥuqqîm* mit *mišwôt* kombiniert wird, so ist das eine Kurzzusammenfassung aller Gesetzstermini von 4,1–2 durch Nennung des ersten und letzten derselben. Vgl. G. BRAULIK, *Die Mittel deuteronomischer Rhetorik erhoben aus Dtn 4,1–40* (AnBib 68; Rom 1978) 86f. Das ist eine Rahmung, wenn auch von etwas anderer Art als die von Dtn 5–26. KNAPP, *Deuteronomium 4*, Anm. 589, lehnt dies allein deshalb ab, weil er seine literarkritische Hypothese, nach der 4,1–2 und 4,40 verschiedenen Händen zuzuteilen sind, schon voraussetzt. Doch selbst unter dieser (von mir nicht geteilten) Voraussetzung wäre diese Erklärung als Intention der (jüngeren) Hand von 4,40 denkbar.

Der Sachverhalt des Auftrags an Mose ist in Dtn 4 wichtig: auf ihn wird schon in 4,5 in einem Nebensatz hingewiesen. Um die Akzentverschiebung in 4,14 gegenüber der sachlichen Vorlage in 5,31 genauer zu sehen, ist folgendes zu beachten: Die Aussage von 4,14 stimmt fast wörtlich mit der von 6,1 überein, nicht mit der von 5,31. Auch in 6,1 wird die Mitteilung der Gesetze durch Jahwe nicht erwähnt und nur von dessen Befehl gesprochen, sie die Israeliten zu lehren. Doch das ist in 6,1 der Punkt, auf den es ankommt: Mose schickt sich jetzt zur lehrenden Gesetzesvermittlung an, empfangen hat er die Gesetze schon vor vierzig Jahren. Daß er nicht noch einmal alle Elemente von 5,31 wiederholt, ist an dieser Stelle narrative Selbstverständlichkeit. In 6,20 wird sogar noch stärker teleskopisch zusammengefaßt werden: da spricht der Sohn zu seinem Vater einfach von den Gesetzen, die Jahwe geboten hat. Das ist aus der Perspektive späterer Generationen formuliert, für die Moses spezielle Vermittlungstätigkeit im Augenblick gar nicht zur Debatte steht, sondern der Blick ganz auf Jahwe gerichtet ist. (Außerdem wird es ein Interesse gegeben haben, die vorgegebene, nicht ins System passende und doch nicht auslöschbare Aussage von 6,17, Jahwe selbst habe, vom System her natürlich am Horeb, die Gebote auferlegt, zumindest interpretativ einzufangen). Jede der drei Stellen 5,31; 6,1 und 6,20 ist von ihrem narrativen Ort her sachgemäß formuliert. Für 4,14 ist es nun aber relevant, daß die abgekürzte Formulierung von 6,1, und zwar so wörtlich wie innerhalb der Satzkonstruktion überhaupt möglich, an jener Erzählstelle eingesetzt wird, wo man die explizitere Formulierung von 5,31 erwarten müßte. Das ist — zumindest für Hörer und Leser, die den deuteronomischen Haupttext schon im Ohr haben, und die dürfte Dtn 4 voraussetzen — als Nullaussage eine profilierte Neuaussage⁽²⁵⁾.

In Jos bis 2 Kön ist der Doppelausdruck *huqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* als alleinstehende Bezeichnung für das deuteronomische Gesetz nur ein einziges Mal belegt, in 1 Kön 9,4. Es könnte noch ein Gefühl dafür vorliegen, daß es um die Zuordnung von Gesetzen und Dekalog geht, denn der Doppelausdruck folgt auf die Rede vom Wandeln vor Jahwe "mit Ungeteiltheit des Herzens und Geradheit" — im Kontext der Salomogeschichte zweifellos eine Anspielung auf das erste Gebot des Dekalogs, von dem Salomo dann abfallen wird. Das wäre besonders leicht begreifbar, wenn man sowohl Dtn 5 als auch 1 Kön 9,1-5 einer einzigen deuteronomistischen Hand, nämlich der vorexili-

(25) Als solche sieht es etwa BRAULIK, "Abfolge", 252. Inadäquater Umgang mit dem Gesamtphänomen, vor allem viel zu schneller Sprung in die Literarkritik, bei MITTMANN, *Deuteronomium* 1,1-6,3, 139f. 163; HOSSFELD, *Dekalog*, 235; KNAPP, *Deuteronomium* 4, 58.

schen Hauptredaktion des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks, zuzuordnen müßte⁽²⁶⁾.

Spätere deuteronomistische und nachdeuteronomistische Autoren haben das Gefühl für die ursprüngliche Funktion und Bedeutung des Doppelausdrucks im inneren Dtn nicht mehr gehabt. Jetzt kann er in längeren Reihen gleichberechtigt neben anderen Termini verwendet werden⁽²⁷⁾. Er kann abgewandelt werden, etwa indem *ḥōq* durch *ḥuqqâ* oder *mišpāṭ* durch *mišwâ* ersetzt wird. Die Reihenfolge der Elemente kann vertauscht werden. Schließlich kann der Ausdruck in einen kollektiven Singular zurücktransponiert werden⁽²⁸⁾.

Die Darstellung ist in den letzten Abschnitten, indem sie vom deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerk sprach, schon von einer relativen in eine absolute Zeitbestimmung hineingeglitten. Eine solche genauere Zuordnung zu festen Größen der gängigen Deuteronomiums-

(26) Grundlegende Argumentation für die Zuteilung von 1 Kön 9,1-5 und 6-9 auf den vorexilischen Verfasser des Geschichtswerks (1-5) und eine exilische Bearbeitung (6-9): R. D. NELSON, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (JSOTSS 18; Sheffield 1981) 73-76. Ich werde demnächst in einer Untersuchung zu 2 Kön 8,19 auf diesen Text und die Textsysteme, zu denen er gehört, zurückkommen (FS W. L. Moran). Im jetzigen Zusammenhang kann ich nicht auf die kontroverse Frage der verschiedenen Schichten und der Datierung des DtrG eingehen. Zu meiner eigenen Position vgl. N. LOHFINK, "Kerygmata des Deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerks", *Die Botschaft und die Boten* (FS. H. W. Wolff; [Hrsg. J. JEREMIAS u. L. PERLITT] Neukirchen-Vluyn 1981) 87-100, 96. Inzwischen sehe ich noch mehr Gründe als damals, doch schon mit einem von Dtn bis 2 Kön reichenden joschijanischen Geschichtswerk zu rechnen, und nicht nur mit der Produktion mehrerer erst im Exil in einem Gesamt-DtrG integrierter dtr Geschichtsdarstellungen. Doch auch diese Frage kann hier offenbleiben. Überblick zur Theoriebildung über das DtrG: H. WEIPPERT, "Das deuteronomistische Geschichtswerk. Sein Ziel und Ende in der neueren Forschung", *TRu* 50 (1985) 213-249. In 1 Kön 9,4 könnte, wenn damals das nur das Wortpaar enthaltende Rahmensystem von Dtn 5-26 noch nicht vorhanden war, durchaus im Hinblick auf die Apposition in Dtn (4,45); 5,31; 6,1.20 formuliert worden sein.

(27) 1 Kön 8,58; 2 Kön 17,37. Für 2 Kön 17,37 vgl. 17,34. In 1 Kön 8,58 könnten immerhin noch die genaueren Bedeutungen aus dem Übergangsbereich von Dtn 5 und 6 oder aus Dtn 26,17 anklingen, doch scheint mir das auch wieder unwahrscheinlich.

(28) Das ist vielleicht so in Jos 24,25, mit hoher Wahrscheinlichkeit in Ex 15,25, vgl. N. LOHFINK, "'Ich bin Jahwe, dein Arzt' (Ex 15,26). Gott, Gesellschaft und menschliche Gesundheit in einer nachexilischen Pentateuchbearbeitung (Ex 15,25b.26)", N. LOHFINK u.a., "Ich will euer Gott werden" (SBS 100; Stuttgart 1981) 11-73, 20f. Ebenso in Esr 7,10.

analyse ist jetzt für die ersten Phasen des Eindringens von *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* in den Text der zweiten Moserede nachzuholen.

Da Dtn 5 narrativ in der Abschiedssituation Moses in Moab situiert ist und eine ausgesprochen narrative Historisierung des deuteronomischen Gesetzes erst im Rahmen deuteronomistischer Geschichtsdarstellung vorstellbar ist⁽²⁹⁾, kann die ganze oben entwickelte Geschichte des Eindringens von *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* in den Deuteronomiumstext erst im Rahmen der deuteronomistischen Arbeit am deuteronomischen Gesetz geschehen sein. Diese begann allerdings schon vorexilisch in den letzten Jahren Joschijas.

Diese Auffassung tritt, speziell bezüglich der Rahmung der Gesetze, und hierbei speziell für Dtn 12,1, in Gegensatz zu üblichen Ansetzungen von Stellen, in denen *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* steht. Für Seitz etwa ist 12,1 Teil seines "älteren, Überschriftensystems", welches er ebenso wie das ganze Rahmungssystem seiner "deuteronomischen Überarbeitung" zuordnet⁽³⁰⁾. Diese sei "wahrscheinlich in der Zeit Josias oder kurz nach seiner Regierungszeit vorgenommen worden"⁽³¹⁾. Das wären die Jahre, in denen ich schon die Herstellung der grundlegenden Fassung des deuteronomistischen Geschichtswerkes oder seiner ersten Textblöcke ansetzen würde, obwohl das Rahmensystem nicht notwendig schon mit ihr verbunden werden müßte. Für Seitz liegt die "deuteronomische Überarbeitung" jedenfalls noch jedem deuteronomistischen Eingriff ins Deuteronomium voraus, denn einen solchen setzt er offenbar erst in exilischer Zeit an. In welche Schwierigkeiten eine vordeuteronomistische Zuordnung bei dem Rahmungssystem führt, zeigt etwa ein Blick auf 11,31. Seitz teilt — mit Recht — 11,31 der gleichen Hand wie 12,1 zu⁽³²⁾. In 11,31 ist von der Überschreitung des Jordans (Verbum: 'br) die Rede. Kann so formuliert werden, ohne daß die deuteronomistische Landnahmeerzählung das Gesetz schon narrativ umgibt oder doch zumindest von der gleichen Hand gerade darum herumgelegt wird?

Soweit die zu entfaltende Hypothese. Im Gegensatz zu der vorher angedeuteten, auf den ersten Blick einfacher und damit plausibler erscheinenden, scheint sie wirklich alle relevanten Fakten zusammenhängend erklären zu können. Setzt man sie voraus, so stellt sich nun

⁽²⁹⁾ Vgl. zuletzt N. LOHFINK, Bespr. U. RÜTERSWORDEN, *Von der politischen Gemeinschaft zur Gemeinde: Studien zu Dt 16,18–18,22* (BBB 65; Frankfurt 1987), in: TLZ 113 (1988) 425–430, 427.

⁽³⁰⁾ SEITZ, *Studien*, 308.

⁽³¹⁾ *Ebd.*, 311.

⁽³²⁾ *Ebd.*, 39f.

die Frage, welchen Textbereich der Ausdruck *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāîm* denn eigentlich im Deuteronomium bezeichnet.

III. Zur Textgröße, die das Wortpaar *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāîm* im Deuteronomium bezeichnet

Ging es im 1. Abschnitt um die Bedeutung des Ausdrucks (*meaning*), so jetzt in diesem 3. Abschnitt um seinen Realitätsbezug (*reference*). Die bezeichnete Realität muß ein Text sein, und zwar ein Textbereich innerhalb des Deuteronomiums.

Zunächst scheint alles klar zu sein, da das Wortpaar *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāîm* ja ein Rahmungssystem charakterisiert. Muß es nicht der von diesem System umrahmte Text sein? Also Dtn 5,1–26,16, dem in 4,45 ja auch eine entsprechende Überschrift voransteht?

Doch wird die Sache dadurch kompliziert, daß gewissermaßen zwei Texte gerahmt sind, 5,1–11,32 und 12,1–26,16. 12,1 hat zudem noch Überschriftcharakter. Und überdies findet sich eine weitere Überschrift, welche die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāîm* ankündet, in 6,1, also mitten in 5,1–11,32. Welche Überschrift löst nun das Referat der *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāîm* real aus: die von 4,45, die von 6,1 oder die von 12,1? Wellhausen hat das Problem auf die klassische Formel gebracht: "Die Gesetze gehn erst Kap. 12 an, vorher will Mose immer zur Sache kommen, kommt aber nicht dazu"⁽³³⁾. Diese Formel unterstellt allerdings schon eine bestimmte Lösung der Frage: nämlich daß die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāîm* nur in Dtn 12–26 stehen⁽³⁴⁾.

Beim Versuch einer Klärung ist zunächst festzustellen, daß das Rahmungssystem bei genauerem Zusehen nicht dazu zwingt, *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāîm* als die Bezeichnung des gesamten umrahmten Textes zu betrachten. Es weist sogar eher auf den begrenzten Bereich von Dtn 12–26.

Denn es enthält eine die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāîm* ankündigende Überschrift, und die steht nun einmal erst in 12,1. Zwar sprechen auch

⁽³³⁾ J. WELLHAUSEN, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs und der historischen Bücher des Alten Testaments* (Berlin ³1899) 190.

⁽³⁴⁾ Ich selbst hatte mich in *Hauptgebot*, 57 für ganz Dtn 5–26 entschieden. Zu gleichem Ergebnis wie Wellhausen kommt BRAULIK, "Abfolge", 253 und Anm. 5. Seine Gründe dafür nennt er im Haupttext. In der Anmerkung dagegen führt er mit nicht zu verkennender Sympathie seine Gründe dafür auf, den Ausdruck auf ganz 5–26 zu beziehen.

5,1 und 11,32 schon von der Promulgation der *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm*⁽³⁵⁾, und sie tun das in partizipialen Aussagen mit der Zeitangabe *hayyôm*. Eine Untersuchung des Gebrauchs dieser syntaktischen Fügung zeigt aber, daß im deuteronomischen Sprachstil aus ihr nicht folgt, die Proklamation der *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* müsse sich hinter 5,1 unmittelbar anschließen oder sei bei 11,32 schon längst im Gang.

Partizipiale Formulierungen sind im Deuteronomium häufig, speziell in den typischen rhetorischen Relativsätzen. Geht es dabei um die Landnahme (wichtigste Verben: *ntn*, *bw'*, '*br*'), dann meint die partizipiale Formulierung nie die gerade laufende Gegenwart, sondern stets die nahe Zukunft. Das ist nicht von der Form, wohl aber vom narrativen Kontext des Buches her eindeutig. Im "Promulgationssatz" (normales Verbum: *šwh* Piel), der die Promulgation des Gesetzes sprachlich immer wieder ins Bewußtsein rückt, geht es innerhalb von Dtn 12–26 zweifellos um einen sich soeben in der Rede vollziehenden Vorgang (Belege: 13,19; 15,5.15; 19,9 — man beachte die geringe Zahl), aber hinter Kapitel 26 ist der Vorgang schon abgeschlossen, wenn er auch nur kurz zurückliegt (Belege: 27,10; 28,1.13.15; 30,2.8.11.16; 32,46). Daher ist es auch nicht ausschließbar, daß bei den Belegen vor Kapitel 12 (4,8.40; 5,1; 6,6; 7,11; 8,1.11; 10,13; 11,8.13.27.28.32 — man beachte die Häufung gegen Ende) der Promulgationsvorgang noch nicht im Gange ist, sondern erst noch bevorsteht. Alle zitierten Belege des Promulgationssatzes unterscheiden sich von den auf die Landnahme bezogenen partizipialen Aussagen durch die ausdrücklich vorhandene Zeitangabe *hayyôm*. Auch diese besagt also nicht notwendig, daß der ausgesagte Vorgang gerade im Gange ist. Das wird durch eine in 9,1 stehende, partizipiale und von der Sache her zweifellos futurische Landnahmeaussage mit *hayyôm* bekräftigt.

(³⁵) 5,1 und 11,32 haben zwar nicht das in Promulgationsaussagen übliche Verbum *šwh* Piel. Doch wäre es wohl falsch, wenn man hier die Erklärung unseres Problems suchte. Denn *šwh* steht innerhalb von Dtn 5–11 dann doch zu oft in Promulgationssätzen. Für die besondere Wortwahl in 5,1 und 11,32 sehe ich zwei mögliche Erklärungen. 1. Neben dem im Vordergrund stehenden autoritativen Aspekt der Gesetzesproklamation sollte wenigstens in den Rahmenversen auch deren paränetischer Charakter reflektiert werden (vgl. LOHFINK, *Hauptgebot*, 273–276). 2. Dieser Rahmen hätte in der Tat eine andere Auffassung vom Verpflichtungsmodus der Gesetze als der von ihm umschlossene Text. Mose würde Israel nur belehren und ihm gewissermaßen anbieten, sich frei für die am Horeb geoffenbarte Gesellschaftsordnung zu entscheiden. Erst bei dem dann in 26,17–19 gespiegelten Vertragsabschluß zwischen Israel und Jahwe würde Jahwe diese Ordnung Israel verpflichtend auferlegen. Deshalb würde dann in 26,16, am Ende des Rahmensystems und zugleich der Gesetzesdarlegung, das Verbum *šwh* eingeführt, doch nun nicht mit Mose, sondern mit Jahwe als grammatischem Subjekt. Vielleicht lassen sich die beiden Erklärungen sogar miteinander verbinden.

In 11,26 steht ferner *hayyôm* bei einem Partizip, das die erst in 16 Kapiteln folgende Proklamation von Segen und Fluch (Dtn 28) ankündet. Der offensichtlich auf eine einzige Hand zurückgehende⁽³⁶⁾ und durchaus beabsichtigte Parallelismus von 11,26 (*ʾeʾēh ʾānōkî nōtēn lipnēkem hayyôm berākā ûkēlālā*) und 11,32 (*ʾet kol ḥaḥuqqîm wʾet hammišpāṭîm ʾašer ʾānōkî nōtēn lipnēkem hayyôm*) spricht eher dafür, daß in 11,32 nicht nur die Proklamation von Segen und Fluch noch bevorsteht, sondern auch die Proklamation von allen (*kol*) *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* — was für deren Eingrenzung auf Dtn 12–26 spräche und mit der Aussage der dann unmittelbar folgenden Überschrift 12,1 übereinstimmt. Erst die Überschrift gibt den Startschuß.

Ist das der Fall, dann muß man allerdings auch die Überschriften in 4,45 und 6,1 entsprechend ernst nehmen und im jetzigen Text eine wirkliche Spannung konstatieren. Stehen in ihm mehrere Konzeptionen der Referenz von *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* nebeneinander, die sich in den verschiedenen Überschriften ausdrücken? Natürlich lassen sie sich im definitiven Text interpretatorisch miteinander versöhnen, und so ist es auf dieser Ebene sicher auch gemeint. Man muß nur an die Bandbreite von Referenzmöglichkeiten denken, die einer Überschrift oder Ankündigung als solcher zukommt.

Auf eine inhaltlich eindeutige Überschrift kann zunächst durchaus noch Vorbereitendes folgen, und erst unterwegs kommt der Diskurs dann zum wirklich Angekündigten. Das Vorbereitende gehört in gewissem Sinne schon zur Referenz der Überschrift, in gewissem Sinne noch nicht. Daher kann, wenn *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* im Endeffekt nur Dtn 12–26 meint, doch schon die Überschrift in 4,45 dies ankündigen, obwohl zunächst einmal einleitend in Dtn 5 die Ätiologie der *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* erzählt wird. Nach erzählter Ätiologie kann Dtn 6,1 die Überschrift von 4,45 wieder aufgreifen, und dann folgt doch zunächst noch sehr viel grundsätzliche Rede, die man trotzdem schon in einem echten und sicher stärkeren Sinn als bei Dtn 5 unter dem Begriff *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* fassen kann. Doch wirklich bei den *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* im genauen Sinn angekommen ist man erst, wenn endlich in 12,1 durch ein drittes Auftreten einer Überschrift die eigentliche Rezitation derselben eingeleitet wird.

(36) Vgl. LOHFINK, *Hauptgebot*, 232–234; SEITZ, *Studien*, 38–40.

Läßt sich der jetzige Text auf diese Weise also sinnvoll lesen, so sollte dies aber nicht darüber hinwegtäuschen, daß dabei eine Spannung ausgeglichen wird. Sie zeigt sich nicht nur an der Mehrzahl der Überschriften, sondern auch an deren nun doch nicht genau übereinstimmender Formulierung. Eine solche Spannung muß entstehungsgeschichtlich erklärt werden. Sie läßt sich auf die innerhalb der Moserede befindliche Spannung zwischen den Überschriften in 6,1 und 12,1 reduzieren, da die außerhalb der Moserede stehende Überschrift 4,45 sekundär formuliert worden sein kann, und zwar sowohl im Blick auf die eine als auch auf die andere Auffassung. Es gilt also, eine entsprechende diachrone Hypothese zu entwickeln.

Ich setze dabei voraus, daß es zur Zeit des Vorbaus von Kapitel 5 schon "Paränese" vom Typ der von Kapitel 6 an folgenden Texte gab, und daß infolgedessen der von Dtn 5 eingeleitete Text nicht direkt mit Material vom Typ der mit Kapitel 12 beginnenden Texte begann.

Die Hauptgebotsparänese, die (außer im wieder narrativen Bereich von Dtn 9f) die Kapitel 6–11 beherrscht, und die autoritativen Charakter beansprucht⁽³⁷⁾, mußte im Sinne von Dtn 5, als dieses Kapitel zum Deuteronomium kam, durchaus zu dem gerechnet werden, was mit dem Ausdruck *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* in 5,31 gemeint ist: Nähere Determinierung der vom Dekalog nur generell bestimmten und im übrigen noch offenen Handlungsfelder durch eine Autorität. Von daher war die Ankündigung von *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* in einer Überschrift in 6,1 sachgemäß. Es ist anzunehmen, daß damals, als Dtn 5 dem deuteronomischen Gesetz vorgeschaltet und auch die Übergangspassage zwischen 5,31 und 6,4 zumindest in ihrem Grundbestand formuliert wurde, die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* auch als mit 6,4 beginnend angesehen wurden. 12,1 (und damit auch 11,32) kann es in diesem Augenblick noch nicht gegeben haben. Alles, was damals schon vom jetzigen Textbestand zwischen 6,4 und 26,16 existierte, konnte in gleicher Weise als *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* gelten. Ob nur die

(37) Dies ergibt sich zum Beispiel aus dem Gebrauch des partizipialen Promulgationssatzes mit Mose als Subjekt und *šwh* Piel als Verb im Anschluß an den Terminus *hammišwōt*, der auch die paränetischen Teile des Gesetzes mitumfaßt. Zu letzterem vgl. BRAULIK, "Ausdrücke", 57f. Belege für solche Formulierungen innerhalb von Dtn 6–11 selbst: 6,2; 8,11; 10,13; 11,13.27.28.

Kerbe in der Mitte, am Übergang von Kapitel 11 zu Kapitel 12, fehlte oder auch der jetzt mit ihr eine Einheit bildende äußere Rahmen in 5,1 und 26,16 (und mit ihm noch 26,17-19), ist eine Frage, die in diesem Zusammenhang nicht geklärt werden kann, es aber auch nicht muß.

Es muß dann eine gewichtige Aktion gewesen sein, als in einem späteren Stadium durch die Schaffung der genannten Kerbe zwischen Kapitel 11 und 12 der Bereich der eigentlichen *ḥuqqîm ûmišpâṭîm* neu definiert und auf das Material hinter 12,1 eingegrenzt wurde. Die Sache ist sicher nicht unter der Hand geschehen. Aber welche eingetretene Schwierigkeit wurde dadurch behoben, welches neue Interesse verfolgt?

Man könnte eine rhetorisch-literarische Erklärung ins Auge fassen. War der Text vielleicht so angewachsen, daß er unförmig wurde und einer weitergehenden Gliederung bedurfte? Hatte vielleicht die Determinierung des ersten Dekalogsgebotes sich nicht nur quantitativ, sondern in der Form von Hauptgebotsparänese teilweise auch qualitativ so eigenständig entwickelt, daß diese Passagen sich in ihrer Gestalt von den eigentlichen Gesetzen immer mehr abhoben, so daß es auch ästhetisch notwendig wurde, die Textmasse in zwei in ihrem Charakter nun doch verschiedene und in ihrem Gewicht einander die Balance haltende Teile aufzugliedern? Oder hing vielleicht auch in deuteronomistischer Zeit die Textentwicklung noch mit sich weiterentwickelnden Ritualen zusammen — öffentlicher Gesetzesverlesung oder gar einer Art Bundeskult —, und dort hatte sich eine Doppelheit entwickelt, die dann notwendigerweise irgendwann auch in den Text eindrang?

Solche Überlegungen erklären vieles. Aber letztlich erklären sie doch nicht, warum nun gerade den grundlegendsten Darlegungen zum ersten Dekalogsgebot der Charakter von *ḥuqqîm ûmišpâṭîm* abgesprochen werden mußte, der ihnen bisher zukam. Rein ästhetische Anliegen — deren Vorhandensein und Mitursächlichkeit sich keineswegs ausschließen läßt — hätten sich verfolgen lassen, ohne daß solche inhaltlich neuqualifizierenden Konsequenzen gezogen werden mußten. Es muß einen sachlich-juristischen Grund für diese Operation gegeben haben.

Es bleibt nur eine Möglichkeit, ihn zu erheben: die möglichst genaue Analyse der Überschrift 12,1, durch deren Schaffung ja die Neudefinition des Umfangs der *ḥuqqîm ûmišpâṭîm* im strengen Sinn erreicht wurde. Wenn sich das bei der Aktion leitende Interesse

überhaupt irgendwo fassen läßt, dann in ihren konkreten Formulierungen. Und diese Überschrift ist ja nicht gerade kurz angelegt.

IV. Zur Intention bei der Eingrenzung der *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* auf Dtn 12–26

Daß Dtn 12,1 nicht nur eine Überschrift ist, sondern (zusammen mit 11,31f) derselben mehrere brisante juristische Angaben beischließt, scheint der modernen Bibelwissenschaft bisher fast völlig entgangen zu sein⁽³⁸⁾.

Die reine Überschrift ist eigentlich nach den drei ersten Wörtern von 12,1 komplett: *'elleh haḥuqqîm wəhammišpāṭîm* "Das sind nun diese *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* (von denen gerade in 11,32 die Rede war)". Vom Gesichtspunkt einer Überschrift aus kann ein nochmaliger Relativsatz nur redundant sein. Ein solcher Relativsatz füllt nun den ganzen Rest des Verses. Formal bestimmt er den Ausdruck *haḥuqqîm wəhammišpāṭîm* näher. Er kann keine "Paränese" sein, wie immer wieder zu lesen ist. Sie würde einen Hauptsatz mit ermahnend-heischender Verbalform fordern. Wenn in diesem Relativsatz Wendungen vorkommen, die sonst im Deuteronomium der "Paränese" dienen, heißt das noch nicht, daß auch hier "Paränese" vorliegt. Vielmehr werden in ihm objektive Aussagen über die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* gemacht.

Zunächst hat man den Eindruck, es solle einfach aufgegriffen werden, was in 11,31f bezüglich dieser *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* schon gesagt worden war, und so solle die Identität des jetzt Folgenden mit dem in 11,32 Angekündigten noch deutlicher unterstrichen werden: *'ăšer tišmerûn la'ăšôt* greift *ûšmartem la'ăšôt* aus Vers 32 auf, dann ist vom Land die Rede, von dem auch Vers 31 sprach (*hā'āreš*), einem Land, das Israel auch schon nach Vers 31 in Besitz nehmen wird (*yrs*).

Dieser Eindruck ist sicher nicht falsch. Doch er erfaßt noch nicht das Entscheidende. Dieses zeigt sich an der unterschiedlichen Weise, in der das Motiv des Landes in 12,1 gegenüber 11,31 weiter-

⁽³⁸⁾ Ausnahmen: N. LOHFINK, Bespr. R. P. MERENDINO, *Das deuteronomische Gesetz. Eine literarkritische, gattungs- und überlieferungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu Dt 12–26* (BBB 31; Bonn 1969), in *TRev* (1976) 93–96; BRAULIK, *Deuteronomium 1–16*, 17, 92.

entwickelt wird. Und damit gelangen wir an die mit der Überschrift verbundenen Sachaussagen über die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm*.

In 11,31f befindet sich eine Klausel über den Beginn der Geltung der *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm*, im Relativsatz von 12,1 eine Klausel über deren Geltungsbereich (*bā'āreš 'ăšer...*) und eine weitere Klausel über deren Geltungsdauer (*kol hayyāmîm*⁽³⁹⁾ *'ăšer 'attem ḥayyîm 'al hā'ādāmā*⁽⁴⁰⁾). Das sind grundlegende juristische Festlegungen. 11,31–12,1, die gliedernde "Kerbe" mitten in der zweiten Moserede, legt also nicht einfach fest, daß von hier ab jene Texte beginnen, die man allein als die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* bezeichnen kann, sondern gibt gewissermaßen eine Definition derselben. Sie definiert sie bezüglich Geltungsbereich (das in Besitz zu nehmende Land, und offenbar dieses allein) und bezüglich Geltungsdauer (von der Besiedelung des Landes bis zum Ende des Wohnens im Land, und offenbar nur dann).

Man kann von daher extrapolieren, daß es für die vorangegangenen Bestimmungen des deuteronomischen Gesetzes offen bleiben soll, ob sie nicht auch außerhalb des Landes und vor der Landnahme oder nach einem eventuellen Landverlust für Israel als Jahwes Wille in Geltung sein sollen. Ist dies der Sinn der Verse, dann haben sie wahrlich ein großes Gewicht, und die Problemlage, aus der sie stammen könnten, beginnt sich abzuzeichnen.

Aber bringen sie damit innerhalb des Deuteronomiums denn etwas Neues? Das ist zunächst zu überprüfen. Will man das tun, dann kann man Dtn 4,1–40 als vermutlich noch späteren und auch Dtn 12,1 schon voraussetzenden Text übergehen. Bei der zweiten Moserede verzichte ich auf ins einzelne gehende Literarkritik und lasse es darauf ankommen, auch unter Umständen spätere Textstücke mitzubetrachten. Das Ergebnis wird trotzdem eindeutig sein.

Die Überschriften in 4,44–49 enthalten keine Angabe über Geltungsbereich und Geltungsdauer, auch nicht der Rahmensatz in 5,1.

⁽³⁹⁾ *kol-hayyāmîm* gehört nicht mehr zu dem von *'ereš* abhängigen Relativsatz zweiten Grades, sondern wird parallel zu *bā'āreš* von der Verbgruppe des diesem übergeordneten Relativsatzes regiert. Das scheint nicht mehr allen neueren Auslegern klar zu sein.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Zur Synonymität von *'ereš* und *'ādāmā* im Dtn und zu den festen Regeln der Wortwahl vgl. J. G. PLÖGER, *Literarkritische, formgeschichtliche und stilkritische Untersuchungen zum Deuteronomium* (BBB 26; Bonn 1967) 121–129. Zu 12,1 vgl. *ebd.* 128.

Der Dekalog begrenzt den Bereich und die Dauer seiner Geltung innerhalb seines eigenen Textes nicht.

5,29 und 5,31 gehören eng zusammen, da in ihnen das typische deuteronomische Wortpaar für Gesetzesbeobachtung (*šmr* + *'šh*) aufgespalten verteilt ist. 5,29 spricht von der Beobachtung des Dekalogs *kol hayyāmīm*. Dies meint nicht "ihr Leben lang" (so die Einheitsübersetzung) oder "ständig", sondern "immerdar", wie der angeschlossene Segenshinweis zeigt: "damit es ihnen und ihren Nachkommen wohlhergeht *l'e'ōlām*". Das *kol hayyāmīm* in 12,1 könnte das von 5,29 durchaus vor Augen haben und sich durch den zugefügten Relativsatz davon abheben. 5,31 spricht von der Befolgung der *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* in dem den Israeliten von Jahwe geschenkten Land. Dies ist positiv gesagt. Ob es auch exklusiv verstanden sein will, kann man wahrscheinlich in Frage stellen. Das Land ist einfach der Ort, wo die von Jahwe für sein Volk entworfene Sozialordnung verwirklicht werden soll. Gilt die Beobachtung über die Aufteilung der Verben für Gesetzesbeobachtung (d.h. eigentlich ist beides jeweils für jede der beiden Aussagen gemeint) analog auch für die Angaben über Zeit und Ort, dann würde dies heißen: nach 5,29.31 gelten Dekalog ebenso wie die *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* in alle Zukunft, und das von Jahwe geschenkte Land ist der natürliche Ort ihrer Verwirklichung. Dieses Verständnis wird dadurch noch verstärkt, daß in 5,29 für den Fall der Übertretung des Dekalogs wohl der Verlust des Landes angedeutet, die Frage der Geltung aber nicht weiter berührt wird.

In 6,1 wird die Aussage über das Land als Ort der Beobachtung der *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* wiederaufgenommen (Verbum ist wie in 5,31 *'šh*). In 6,2 wird zwar die Terminologie des von der palindromischen Gesamtkonstruktion her entsprechenden Verses 5,29 aufgenommen (*šmr, mišwōt* Jahwes), aber durch Hinzufügung von *ḥuqqōtāyw* (Samaritanus: *ḥuqqāyw*) und einen Promulgationssatz mit Mose als Subjekt wird im ganzen doch von allem Jahwegewollten, vom Dekalog und von den durch Mose zu promulgierenden Gesetzen, gesprochen, was verständlich ist, da wir uns ja seit 6,1 in der Überschrift für die *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* befinden⁽⁴¹⁾. Was die mit 5,29 verbundene Zeitbestimmung angeht, so kehrt sie wieder, doch in anderer Form: als das Subjekt der Beobachtung wird die Gesamtheit der gleichzeitig lebenden Generationen genannt (du, dein Sohn und dein Enkel), und dann

(41) Vgl. oben S. 9f.

wird hinzugefügt: "solange du lebst". Ich glaube nicht, daß hier exklusiv nur die Adressaten der Gesetzesverkündung in Moab und die beiden folgenden Generationen gemeint sind. Vielmehr stehen die genannten gleichzeitig lebenden Generationen für das Israel aller Zeiten in allen seinen jeweils vorhandenen Generationen.

6,10-16, ebenso später 8,7-18 setzen wie selbstverständlich das von Jahwe geschenkte Land als den Ort der Gesetzesbeobachtung voraus, ohne dabei jedoch irgendwelche exklusiven Geltungsgrenzen räumlicher oder zeitlicher Art ins Auge zu fassen. Das tut auch keine der mehrfach auftretenden offenen oder indirekten Vertreibungs- und Vernichtungsandrohungen für den Fall der Nichtbeobachtung des Gesetzes. Sie haben eine andere Problemperspektive.

Neuartiges bringt 6,18f: Dieser Text geht weiter als alles bisher Gesagte und löst die Gesetzesbeobachtung vom Landbesitz. Die beiden Verse setzen nämlich voraus, daß die Erfüllung nicht nur des Dekalogs, sondern auch der Gesetze⁽⁴²⁾ schon eine Vorbedingung für die Möglichkeit der Landeroberung ist. Die Gesetze sind also ab sofort zu beobachten, nicht erst im Land⁽⁴³⁾. Die gleiche Aussage findet sich später noch in 8,1; 11,8 und 11,22-25⁽⁴⁴⁾.

(42) Die beiden Verse schließen sich in der Auffassung des zu befolgenden Jahwewillens an den Vers 17 an, den sie (trotz Numeruswechsel) bewußt verlängern — vgl. z.B. die Ergänzung von *šmr* durch das nach diesem Verb ergänzend zu erwartende *ʾšh*. Die in 18a stehende Formulierung *hayyāšār wʾhaṭṭōb bʾēnē YHWH* hat in der deuteronomischen Sprache keine festgelegte Referenz, sondern ist jeweils von der vorher im Kontext besprochenen Größe her zu verstehen: vgl. 12,25.28; 13,19; 21,9. Es geht also um die Beobachtung der in 6,17 genannten Größen: die *mišwōt* könnten den Dekalog meinen, *ʾēdōt + ḥuqqîm* meinen mit Sicherheit mehr. Vgl. dazu oben bei der Diskussion von 6,20.

(43) Vgl. F. GARCÍA LÓPEZ, "Deut., VI et la tradition-rédaction du Deutéronome", *RB* 85 (1978) 161-200 u. 86 (1979) 59-91, 172f. Dort Verweis auf C. Steuernagel und A. R. Hulst.

(44) Zur Zuteilung von 6,18f; 8,1 und 11,8.22-25 zu dem von R. Smend entdeckten dtr Bearbeiter "DtrN" und einer sich mit ihm auseinandersetzenen Schicht vgl. LOHFINK, "Kerygmata", 98f; G. BRAULIK, "Gesetz als Evangelium. Rechtfertigung und Begnadigung nach der deuteronomischen Tora", *ZTK* 79 (1982) 127-160 = ders., *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums* (SBAB 2; Stuttgart 1988) 123-160, 144-152 (zu 6,18f und 9,1-5). Ob diese Schichten vor oder nach Dtn 12,1 anzusetzen sind, kann offen bleiben. Hier nicht zu erörternde Gründe scheinen mir dafür zu sprechen, daß sie jünger sind.

Damit ist schon das Textstück 11,26–12,1 erreicht. Es hat sich in der Tat gezeigt: die genaue Festlegung von Geltungsbereich und Geltungsdauer, die 11,32 und 12,1, zusammengenommen, bieten, ist innerhalb der zweiten Moserede etwas völlig Neues. Hier erklingt eine bisher noch nicht gemachte, vielleicht auch gar nicht gewollte, juristisch unter Umständen höchst folgenreiche Aussage: die von kundiger Hand eingefügte Eingrenzung der Geltung aller nun folgenden Gesetze geographisch auf den Bereich des verheißenen Landes und zeitlich auf die Zeit, die Israel sich in diesem Land befindet.

Die rabbinische Auslegung hat die Aussage von Dtn 12,1 auch immer so verstanden. Ich hoffe, dies an anderer Stelle zeigen zu können⁽⁴⁵⁾.

Damit dürfte deutlich sein, was das spezifische Anliegen von Dtn 11,32 und 12,1 ist und weshalb zu einem noch näher zu bestimmenden Zeitpunkt diese "Kerbe" in den Text der zweiten Moserede des Deuteronomiums eingeprägt worden ist: Alle Gesetze, die von da ab folgen, sollen als Gesetze aufgefaßt werden, die nur für ein Israel gelten, das in seinem Land lebt, während diese Einschränkung bei den Gesetzen, die vorausgehen und die im wesentlichen Kommentare zum ersten Dekalogsgebot sind, nicht gilt, noch weniger natürlich beim Dekalog selbst.

Insofern erweist sich nun auch der oben gemachte Versuch, für den Endtext des Deuteronomiums aus der Spannung zwischen den Überschriften in 4,45; 6,1 und 12,1 eine Synthese herzustellen, zwar nicht als schlechthin falsch, wohl aber als zu einseitig nur vom literarischen Gesichtspunkt her entworfen. Juristisch betrachtet beginnen mit 6,1 durchaus schon *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm*. Nur beginnen dann innerhalb dieser in 12,1 *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm*, denen diese Bezeichnung in einem engeren Sinn zukommt. Dieser Sinn ist in 12,1 selbst angezeigt. Es handelt sich um jene *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm*, die nur im Lande gelten, und das nur so lange, wie Israel sich im Lande befindet.

Nun kann man nur noch fragen, wann innerhalb der überhaupt in Frage kommenden Periode der Textgeschichte des Deuteronomiums mit einer Situation zu rechnen ist, die es nahelegte, eine solche Unterscheidung einzuführen. Will man die Unterscheidung nicht als rein theoretisches Gedankengespinnst betrachten, dann setzt ihre Ein-

⁽⁴⁵⁾ Vgl. N. LOHFINK, "Zum rabbinischen Verständnis von Dtn 12,1", in einer demnächst erscheinenden Festschrift.

führung voraus, daß Israel oder Teile von Israel nicht mehr im Land Israel waren und daß für diese Menschen die Beobachtung zumindest vieler Gesetze, die zwischen Dtn 12 und 26 stehen, ein Problem darstellte, während zugleich ein Interesse am Bleiben in der alleinigen Jahweverehrung bestand und Texte wie der Dekalog auch selbstverständlich bejaht wurden. In einer solchen Situation wäre es sinnvoll gewesen, nicht nur zwischen dem Dekalog und den seine Handlungsfelder näher regelnden Gesetzen zu unterscheiden (wie bisher), sondern (überdies) noch einmal innerhalb der *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* zwischen solchen, die überall, und solchen, die nur im verheißenen Lande gelten. Wann war das?

Es kommt nur die Zeit einer Gola in Frage. Da die vorausgesetzte Verpflichtung auf das deuteronomische Gesetz erst von Joschija ab anzunehmen ist, kommt erst die Gola Judas im 6. Jahrhundert in Frage. Wann in ihr allerdings das Problem bewußt aufkam und auf diese Weise gelöst wurde, kann von allem bisher Untersuchten her kaum noch genauer bestimmt werden. Es muß keineswegs ein Problem der ersten Stunde nach der ersten Deportation gewesen sein. Es setzt voraus, daß ein wirklicher Wille zustandegekommen war, das von Joschija eingeführte Gesetz als maßgebend zu betrachten, und daß sich dann die durch die neue Lage gegebenen Schwierigkeiten zeigten. Erst dann kam es darauf an, das Gesetz durch die Vornahme dieser kleinen "Einkerbung" irgendwo in der Mitte juristisch so zu differenzieren, daß es einerseits als ganzes Jahwes ein für alle Mal geäußelter Wille bleiben konnte, daß man aber doch bei allem, was die Existenz im konkreten Land Israel voraussetzte, frei war, sich von seiner Beobachtung zu dispensieren und nur für kommende Tage wieder auf seine Erfüllbarkeit zu hoffen.

Was durch die Einfügung von Dtn 12,1 geschah, war Anpassung an die Realität, war "erleichternd". Es wurde Raum geschaffen für neue Formen, durch die die vom Dekalog gezeichneten Verhaltensfelder konkret neu ausgefüllt werden konnten. Zumindest bei dem Israel, das sich nicht in seinem Land befand — denn für die im Land wohnenden Judäer galten die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* von Dtn 12–26 ja nach wie vor. Diese Teillockerung des verpflichtenden Bandes war das leitende Interesse.

Später, als die Existenz des größeren Teils Israels in der Diaspora zu einer nicht mehr rückgängig zu machenden Normalität geworden war, mußte ein umgekehrtes Interesse entstehen: daß nämlich doch auch in der Diaspora möglichst viel von allen Gesetzen beob-

achtet würde. Der großzügige Schnitt bei 12,1, der alles, was dann folgte, aus der Geltung außerhalb des Landes zunächst einmal herausnahm, war nicht mehr erträglich. Das führte dann zu grundlegenden rabbinischen Unterscheidungen und einer an sie anknüpfenden Kasuistik⁽⁴⁶⁾.

Was die rabbinische Auslegung später aufzufangen versuchte, eine gewisse Abwertung von Dtn 12–26 durch die Überschrift in 12,1, muß natürlich von Anfang an empfunden worden sein. Vielleicht spiegelt sich eine solche geringere Wertung in der Tatsache, daß der doch wohl jüngere Text Dtn 4,1–40 in 4,14 die Mitteilung der *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* durch Jahwe an Mose signifikativ ausspart⁽⁴⁷⁾. Im übrigen werden Israel nach 4,1–12 die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* außerhalb des Landes gelehrt, aber dort muß es sie nur hören und lernen — das genügt, damit Jahwe Israel am Leben erhält und ihm das Land zum Besitz gibt: 4,1. Durchzuführen sind sie dann *bʿqereb hā'āreṣ*: 4,5. Ihre und aller Gesetze Durchführung garantiert, daß Israel im Lande bleiben kann: 4,40. Vielleicht hat der Verfasser von Dtn 4 für seine im Exil lebenden Adressaten damit einiges bei ihnen Umstrittene klargestellt. Zum Beispiel, daß sie die *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm* auch in Babylon durchaus zu lernen hatten, obwohl diese selbst sich dann in Dtn 12,1 als für sie nicht verpflichtend erklärten. Allein die Aufrechterhaltung ihrer Kenntnis unter den Verbannten und ihre Kenntnisnahme durch die fremden Völker, unter denen man weilte, konnte zum Lob Israels und seines Gottes dienen: 4,6–8. Die Kenntnis genügte, daß die Exulantengemeinden am Leben blieben, in der Hoffnung, irgendwann auch wieder das Land zurückzuerhalten: 4,1⁽⁴⁸⁾. Doch der Grund für die Katastrophe, die zur Verbannung geführt hatte, lag woanders, war zentraler, hing nicht an Beobachtung oder Nichtbeobachtung der detaillierten *ḥuqqîm ûmišpāṭîm*. Ebenso-

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Vgl. die oben, Anm. 45 angekündigte Arbeit.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Vgl. oben S. 13f.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Zum Vorangehenden vgl. G. BRAULIK, "Weisheit, Gottesnähe und Gesetz — Zum Kerygma von Deuteronomium 4,5–8", *Studien zum Pentateuch* (FS. W. Kornfeld; [Hrsg. G. BRAULIK] Wien 1977) 165–195 = ders., *Studien zur Theologie des Deuteronomiums* (SBAB 2; Stuttgart 1988) 53–93. 171–173, bes. Anm. 47. Die vorausgesetzte syntaktische Analyse von 4,1 (der *l'ma'an*-Satz hängt an *šma'*, nicht an *la'āšôt*) wird z.B. mit Nachdruck von MITTMANN, *Deuteronomium 1,1–6,3*, 115, vertreten, dessen literarkritische Folgerungen daraus sich im Rahmen deuteronomistischer rhetorischer Sprache allerdings nicht aufzwingen.

wenig ist die Rückkehr in Israels Land von so etwas wie ihrer Beobachtung jetzt in Babylonien abhängig. Auch sie hängt an Einfacherem und Grundlegenderem. Von all dem handelt der Kern des Textes in 4,9-39. Darum geht es seinem Verfasser natürlich. Aber, indem er seine Paränese der deuteronomischen "Tora" (vgl. 4,8) als Interpretament vorausschickt, ist er natürlich verpflichtet, sich im Rahmen seines Textes auch auf sie als ganze und speziell auf ihren offenbar problematischsten Teil, Dtn 12-26, zu beziehen, und er benutzt die Gelegenheit, auch hier einiges klarzustellen⁽⁴⁹⁾.

Mit diesen Überlegungen sind keineswegs alle Probleme von Dtn 12,1 geklärt. Ich habe zum Beispiel den Numeruswechsel innerhalb dieses Verses und die für das Deuteronomium sehr ungewöhnliche vergangenheitliche Aussage von der Gabe des Landes durch Gott gar nicht berührt. Ich glaube, eine Beschäftigung mit diesen Problemen könnte nochmals etwas Licht auf die juristische Frage des Geltungsbereichs des deuteronomischen Gesetzes und auf die chronologische Frage des Zeitansatzes von Dtn 12,1 werfen. Doch das soll an anderer Stelle versucht werden⁽⁵⁰⁾.

Phil.-Theol. Hochschule St. Georgen
Offenbacher Landstraße 224
D-6000 Frankfurt a. M. 70
Bundesrepublik Deutschland

Norbert LOHFINK SJ

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Zur hier vorausgesetzten literarkritischen Einheitlichkeit von Dtn 4,1-40 vgl. zuletzt N. LOHFINK, Bespr. von KNAPP, *Deuteronomium 4*, in: *TRev* 84 (1988) 279-281.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Dieser Versuch wird voraussichtlich in einer Festschrift für Josef Scharbert erscheinen. Vorgesehener Titel: "Dtn 12,1 und Gen 15,18: Das dem Samen Abrahams geschenkte Land als der Geltungsbereich der deuteronomischen Gesetze". Die beiden Aufsätze sind in allem wesentlichen schon 1983 und 1984 ausgearbeitet worden, dann bedauerlicherweise wegen anderer Arbeiten liegengeblieben und 1988 nur noch einmal überarbeitet worden. Ich danke Georg Braulik für mehrfache Lektüre des Manuskripts in seinen verschiedenen Phasen.

SOMMAIRE

Le binôme *ḥōq ūmišpāt* signifie: «ordonnance par laquelle une situation juridique antérieure pendante a été éclaircie par une autorité». Le pluriel *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* fut introduit dans la littérature dt/dtr comme apposition à *hammišwâ* (= tous les commandements deutéronomiques) en Dt 5,31; 6,1, quand par le moyen de Dt 5 une théorie du rapport des commandements dt au décalogue était créée (Dtr I): cela conceptualisa cette théorie. D'abord tous les commandements qui suivent Dt 6,4 furent désignés. Ensuite le binôme *ḥuqqīm ūmišpāṭīm* comme tel fut utilisé pour encadrer Dt 5-11 et 12-26. Par la proposition relative contenue dans l'intitulé Dt 12,1 l'expression ne renvoyait plus qu'à Dt 12-26, car durant l'exil à Babylone la validité des commandements de Dt 12-26 fut sans doute restreinte au peuple qui était resté dans la terre d'Israël. Les exilés étaient par là dispensés de les observer. Cela posa plus tard un problème aux rabbins. Pour d'ultérieures réflexions sur Dt 12,1 voir un article de l'A. à paraître sous peu dans le FS Josef Scharbert.

Narrative and Meaning in the Books of Kings

The meaning of the Books of Kings is, it seems to me, one of the areas of Old Testament interpretation which has been least well-served by Old Testament criticism. The analysis of F. M. Cross, supported by the study of R. D. Nelson, still seems to be the most influential approach to the understanding of the books, and bids fair, according to N. Lohfink, to remain so, despite the energy of the disciples of R. Smend⁽¹⁾. There is, however, a perceptible move back towards a single author of the deuteronomistic history (DtH)⁽²⁾. The present article will tend to support this movement, with special reference to the Books of Kings. The argument will proceed by attempting to show what kind of writing the Books of Kings represent, and letting their meaning unfold by a survey of a number of important passages. It will lead in due course to a consideration of 2 Kgs 23,25-27, the passage that is crucial above all others to Cross's theory. It will become apparent, however, that that passage can only properly be considered at a late stage in the argument. Finally, it will be important to consider the meaning of Kings in relation to the other books that compose DtH.

The approach offered here is influenced by the modern tendency to view books of the Old Testament, provisionally at least, as literary units and to look for sophistication in their execution. Here the approach of Cross to Kings differs dramatically from the approach

⁽¹⁾ F. M. CROSS, *Canaanite Myth and Hebrew Epic* (Cambridge, MA 1973) 274-289; R. D. NELSON, *The Double Redaction of the Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield 1981); N. LOHFINK, *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung. Gestalt und Botschaft* (N. LOHFINK, ed.) (Leuven 1985) 45; cf. his discussion of Spieckermann on 43-44.

⁽²⁾ The most significant impetus to a re-establishment of a single author has come from H.-D. HOFFMANN, *Reform und Reformen: Untersuchungen zu einem Grundthema der deuteronomistischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Zürich 1980). Cf. T. R. HOBBS, *2 Kings* (Waco, Texas 1985) XXIV-XXV; B. O. LONG, *I Kings with an Introduction to Historical Literature* (Grand Rapids 1984) 14-18.

of R. Polzin to Deuteronomy – Judges⁽³⁾. Cross's method is in the older literary critical tradition⁽⁴⁾. This is not widely regarded as setting it at odds, by definition, with that of Polzin and the newer literary approach; indeed, some scholars would see the traditional literary/historical enterprise as co-existing peacefully with and separately from the newer methods⁽⁵⁾. However, Cross's argument does involve judgments about the nature of the writing in the Books of Kings. His Dtr¹ is "a propaganda work of the Josianic reformation..."; as such, while it incorporates a strain of chastisement for seasons of apostasy, it is in the end univocally positive and optimistic, proclaiming hope for Judah through the promise to David, because "a righteous scion of David has sprung from Judah"⁽⁶⁾. His Dtr², with the rather different task of explaining the fall of Judah, is similarly univocal, and something of a literary hack to boot⁽⁷⁾. It is when Cross makes literary judgments of this sort that he occupies the same conceptual ground as Polzin and the newer critics. In principle, therefore, studies of the kind that Polzin has done on Deuteronomy – Judges can and do affect conclusions about authorship.

It is important to set our study of Kings in context by mentioning some features of the preceding books of DtH, as they have been observed by other scholars. First, they are not univocal; they are the voices neither of simple triumphalism nor of mere despair. Rather, it is of the essence of their style to work with contrast, often through irony, to effect their meaning⁽⁸⁾. Polzin, for example,

(3) R. POLZIN, *Moses and the Deuteronomist* (New York 1980).

(4) Sée CROSS, *Myth*, 275 and note, for his orientation to 19th and 20th century criticism.

(5) So D. GUNN, "New Directions in the Study of Hebrew Narrative", *JSOT* 39 (1987): "I see separate roads for a long way ahead"; 73. Cf. A. D. H. MAYES, *The Story of Israel between Settlement and Exile* (London 1983) 20-21. Gunn thus takes issue with M. STERNBERG, *The Poetics of Biblical Narrative* (Bloomington, Indiana 1985), who insists that the Old Testament narratives, while entirely literary, are also historiographical in intent; 30.

(6) CROSS, *Myth*, 283-285, cf. 288.

(7) *Ibid.*, 285-289.

(8) Scholars differ considerably in their understanding of what exactly is implied by irony. For some, irony is more than a device used by an author to convey his meaning, but can actually have the effect of casting doubt upon the very point of view which seems to be taken by the narrator, or indeed by

points to the incongruity of Israel being allowed, in Deuteronomy, to occupy the land, in spite of her antecedent and chronic disobedience, and in the face of Deuteronomy's own indissoluble connexion between land-possession and obedience. The result is a theology of grace that overcomes law, and a message that runs counter, in Polzin's treatment, to many of the individual propositions in Deuteronomy⁽⁹⁾.

Both Polzin and B. Webb depict the Book(s) of (Joshua and) Judges as measuring the increasing gulf between the promise of land and its actual fulfilment in Israel's experience. By the end of Judges Israel certainly *resides* in the land, yet it is suggested by various hints that she has forfeited her title to it, and is liable to a judgment which will serve to affirm the freedom of YHWH from all manipulation by his people⁽¹⁰⁾. The ironic portrayal of Israel's history continues into the Books of Samuel. Already E. M. Good showed the ironic character of the story of Saul's rise (1 Sam 8–12), based on a unified reading of that section (a kind of reading now broadly supported by R. P. Gordon)⁽¹¹⁾. The close links between Judges and 1 Samuel in their portrayal of the issue of kingship have been well noted by D. Jobling, and again by Polzin⁽¹²⁾. The result of this por-

the "implied author" (the two being distinct). See POLZIN, *Moses*, 191, cf. 185f., on the essential ambiguity of Dtr., and cf. R. D. NELSON, "The Anatomy of the Books of Kings", *JSOT* 40 (1988) 46–48. This view suffers, I think, from the strictures of STERNBERG, *Poetics*, 9, where he criticises the abuse of the so-called "intentionalist fallacy", and argues for what he calls "embodied" or "objectified" intention, as a prerequisite of all communication. The present article is based on the belief that it is natural to assume, until investigation proves otherwise, that DtH embodies a coherent purpose.

⁽⁹⁾ POLZIN, *Moses*, 25–29. Polzin adopts Uspensky's "ultimate semantic authority" (B. USPENSKY, *A Poetics of Composition* [Berkeley 1973]), viz. a super-ordinate level of meaning in a text which is expressed through and above several subordinate "voices".

⁽¹⁰⁾ B. WEBB, *The Book of the Judges* (Sheffield 1987). The point is made frequently in Webb's analysis; see e.g. 174, 186f., 208.

⁽¹¹⁾ E. M. GOOD, *Irony in the Old Testament* (Sheffield 1981) 56–80, especially 63–64; R. P. GORDON, *1 & 2 Samuel* (Exeter 1986) 30–35.

⁽¹²⁾ D. JOBLING has treated Judges 6–9 as a proleptic counter to the ideology of kingship expressed in 1 Sam 8–12: *The Sense of Biblical Narrative: Structural Analyses in the Hebrew Bible II* (Sheffield 1986) 85–86. POLZIN, *Bib* 69 (1988) 123–125 has challenged this position, rightly in my view, arguing that Judges 6–9 does indeed anticipate 1 Sam 8–12, not to criticise it, but

trayal is to put a question-mark beside the role of the kings from the outset (it is not Saul alone who is in view in 1 Sam 8,7-18), which is not even set aside even by the dynastic promise of 2 Sam 7. Indeed, it is hardly accidental that the David who worships God because of the dynastic promise (2 Sam 7,18-29), and who is glimpsed ruling justly in 2 Sam 8,15, quickly becomes the lustful and indecisive figure of chs. 9-20.

As the institution of kingship thus begins and continues in compromise, so it is with the temple. Nathan's oracle makes it plain that this no more than the kingship is ideal in God's eyes (2 Sam 7,5-7), and it too has its origins in questionable circumstances, when its location is discovered in the context of God's judgment on David and Israel for his sin in the matter of the census (2 Sam 24,15-25).

If, therefore, we bring to our reading of Kings these observations about the preceding books of DtH, certain features of an interpretation already suggest themselves. If the matter of Israel's election and uniqueness is raised in Judges (with Webb)⁽¹³⁾, it can be said to continue with even greater force into Kings. Kings is arguably *all about* a loss of identity, of which loss of land is finally a function. The division of the kingdom is a first manifestation of this. It is no mere "casting off" of the north. On the contrary, the king of the northern kingdom is regularly styled "the King of Israel", even though it is here that the most profound apostasy comes, even though he is not Davidic, and even though succession is largely by main force. Rather, separation is part of the problematic of being Israel. The question Who is Israel? hangs over these books. Furthermore, the institutions which are central to Kings, and which seem to be the vehicles of Israel's hope, namely king and temple, are themselves already in question, because of their treatment in the Books of Samuel (and indeed in Judges, in the case of kingship). All this suggests that a sensitive reading of Kings will have to expect that discrepancy between surface statement and underlying meaning which others have found to characterise the earlier books of DtH.

We turn now to a more detailed consideration of passages in Kings, which will support the interpretation suggested.

rather to express a *similar* view of kingship. Cf. WEBB, *Judges*, 151-159, on Israel's first experiment with kingship.

(13) WEBB, *Judges*, 179.

Solomon

Solomon represents, in a real sense, the peak of the monarchy's achievement. Nevertheless, there are clues from early in his story that this is not a simple picture. (Such a judgment can be made on predominantly historical grounds, such as that Solomon's style of rule was always likely to lead to the disintegration of the United Kingdom after his death. I am more concerned here, however, with indications that arise from the form of the narrative.) No sooner is Solomon's kingdom "established" (1 Kgs 2,46) than he marries Pharaoh's daughter (3,1), a move which is clearly political, and which we cannot but see as the beginning of a "return to Egypt", in the terms of Deut 17,6. The marriage in itself breaches Deut 7,3, and aims a blow at the purity of Israel. Still in 3,1, the writer raises a further question about Solomon's priorities when, in a twist of the play on *bayith* in 2 Sam 7, he records the building of the king's own house before that of YHWH. (The hint is reinforced by the time-scales mentioned in 6,38; 7,1.) In view of these features of 3,1, it is likely that the note in 3,2 that the people were still sacrificing on the high places because the house of the LORD had not yet been built, far from being a deuteronomic excuse for Solomon⁽¹⁴⁾, is a rebuke for him. The appearance of the introductory particle *raq* here anticipates its use subsequently in Kings whenever high praise for a king is modified by the notice that he did not extirpate high-place worship (e.g. 2 Kgs 14,4)⁽¹⁵⁾. Its further use in 3,3, of Solomon himself, shows that it is right to read it as a mark against the king also in v. 2.

The opening of ch. 3, therefore, the chapter in which Solomon gains approval for his request for wisdom rather than wealth, carries forward the motif of flawed kingship. The placing of these indicators *before* the story of his prayer for wisdom and the picture of his

⁽¹⁴⁾ M. NOTH, *The Deuteronomistic History* (Sheffield 1981) 127-128, regarded 1 Kgs 3,2 as a late addition to Dtr intended to minimise the censure upon Solomon present in v. 3b, by shifting it to the people. He also regarded 3,1 as late, dependent upon 9,24. The reading he thus proposes comes from an understanding of the original deuteronomic story as depicting Solomon's reign first positively then negatively, 58. Our reading sees the arrangement of these details as serving a more integrated purpose than this.

⁽¹⁵⁾ GUNN, "Directions", 72, has drawn attention to the use of the word *raq* in Kings as a pointer to the ironical nature of the writing.

greatness prevents us from reading the whole story of Solomon as if it merely told of a potentially great king who, unfortunately and at a late stage, went into decline. The manner of the telling conveys the message that there could be no permanent salvation for Israel in a Solomon.

The prayer of Solomon in 1 Kgs 8 provides the next context in which face-value statement conceals more. The king's innocent-looking parenthesis: "...for there is no man who does not sin..." (v. 46) is heavy with irony in the mouth of the king who has recently established the dynasty promised to his father, dedicated the temple as the same promise foretold he would, and furnished a paradigm of ruling in wisdom. The irony is that he, perhaps as much as any of his successors, will demonstrate the proposition's truth, as the narrative will shortly make very clear. The reflection on human fallibility is, therefore, pregnant. In the moment when both the monarchy and the temple are apparently put on their soundest footing, it undermines both. How can the dynasty succeed if "there is no man who does not sin"? The picture is filled out by the message throughout the prayer, and especially at vv. 46-53, which detaches hope for the future not only from the dynasty but from physical presence at the temple. The prayer is rightly seen as one of the indicators of a theology of hope beyond disaster in DtH. Nevertheless, it also serves, coming at this point in the narrative, to give pause to the thought that the Davidic dynasty is proceeding propitiously. Moreover, it casts its shadow further than Solomon himself, providing an ironic counterpoint to every positive evaluation of Solomon's successors, and stretches all the way to Josiah.

1 Kgs 9,16 has a so-called "frame-break" which is revealing about the real measure of Solomon's achievement. It tells us that Pharaoh had taken Gezer from the Canaanites and given it to Solomon as a dowry⁽¹⁶⁾. Apparently, then, in spite of Solomon's vaunted

⁽¹⁶⁾ W. F. ALBRIGHT, *JPOS* IV (1924) 142-144, and *Archaeology and the Religion of Palestine* (Baltimore 1956) 213-214, suggested that Gezer in this passage should be read "Gerar". The suggestion has no text-critical basis, however, and is well opposed, on other grounds, by J. GRAY, *I & II Kings* (London 1977) 118-120. Cf. Y. AHARONI, *The Land of the Bible* (London 1979), who finds archaeological confirmation of 1 Kgs 9,16 (91), and offers his own reason why Gezer is said to have fallen to Pharaoh despite Solomon's evident strength at the time (302-305).

extensive rule (4,21), Gezer had been held by the Canaanites (cf. Josh 16,10) until not he but Pharaoh had dispossessed them. The greatest king of Israel had to receive part of his own land as a bounty from the King of Egypt. How much, then, did even Solomon possess the promised land? The parenthesis, while formally it seems unimportant, is in fact charged with significance for the portrayal of Solomon's reign.

The success of Solomon, therefore, is highly ambivalent. Indeed, under him, the gains made by David begin to be rolled back; the unity of the kingdom is undone, the "rest from enemies" which David established is short-lived (1 Kgs 11,9-25), and a question-mark now stands indelibly beside the future of the institution of monarchy itself.

"for the sake of David my servant..."

Solomon's forfeiture of ten tribes and retention of one⁽¹⁷⁾ is obviously central to the evaluation of his reign, and to the message of Kings (1 Kgs 11,13, cf. 11,36; 15,4; 2 Kgs 8,19). It heightens the tension between the promise, which has no explicit conditions attached in 2 Sam 7, and its vulnerability because of Israel's unfaithfulness. The permanence of the promise is stressed by the terms of 1 Kgs 11,36 (*kol hayyāmīm*). One possible interpretation, adopted by Nelson, is that the division of the kingdom itself marks the distinction between fulfilment and non-fulfilment. The promise cannot finally be broken nor its benefits lost (cf. v. 39), and it is therefore carried inexorably towards fulfilment by the Davidic descendant in Jerusalem. Nelson thinks that the saying about a Davidic "lamp"⁽¹⁸⁾ recurs at 1 Kgs 15,4 and 2 Kgs 8,19 to explain why YHWH does not punish Abijam and Jehoram, the first two kings of Judah after Rehoboam who are judged negatively. His understanding of the non-

(17) The odd arithmetic has been variously accounted for. It seems that the "one tribe" is additional to Judah, but may be understood to be any one of Levi, Benjamin or Simeon; NELSON, *Double Redaction*, 110-111.

(18) I thus adopt RSV's translation of *nîr*, though in common with other possible translations, it is somewhat uncertain; NELSON, *Double Redaction*, 108-109.

appearance of the phrase after 2 Kgs 8,19 is that the author (his "Dtr") has by this time made his point⁽¹⁹⁾.

However, it is possible to interpret the distribution of the phrase somewhat differently. If it was necessary to remind the reader of the promise to David in connexion with Abijam and Jehoram, how much more for the likes of Ahaz and Manasseh? The dropping of the motif is in fact an ominous feature of the developing narrative. A detail that supports the view that the appeal to David becomes progressively less sanguine is the qualification that is entered in relation to the promise at 1 Kgs 15,5, viz.: "he did what was right in the eyes of the LORD... *except (raq) in the matter of Uriah the Hittite*". This contrasts with 1 Kgs 14,8, where the allusion to David was entirely positive.

These features of the narrative run parallel to another tendency, namely the progressively more explicit conditionality of the dynastic promise. The difference between 2 Sam 7,14 and 1 Kgs 2,4 is sometimes explained in source-critical terms. It can, however, equally well be seen as the unfolding of what had been implicit in the dynastic promise⁽²⁰⁾, a growing drum-beat which signals the discrepancy between expectation and performance in the life of the kings. It becomes clearer that there is a deep tension in the narrative, whose resolution will not be in terms of unqualified hope for Judah in contrast to menace for the north only.

Rehoboam

Under the very first king who reigns in Judah as a "lamp" for David, the people "did what was evil in the sight of the LORD" (1 Kgs 14,22). The contrast with the Davidic ideal is stark. Most tellingly there is a contrast with the "wise" Solomon. Rehoboam is, more than anything else, the king who could not tell good advice when he saw it, the "counsel" of his father represented by the "old men who had stood before Solomon" (1 Kgs 12,6). Solomon prayed for wisdom to rule his people well; he is succeeded in Jerusalem by a fool, who deliberately turns his back on that very wisdom. Rehoboam

⁽¹⁹⁾ Ibid., 117.

⁽²⁰⁾ On the implicit conditionality of 2 Sam 7,14 cf. HOBBS, *2 Kings*, xxiv.

boam, then, heavily qualifies the promise of a "lamp" for David in Jerusalem.

Asa and Jehoshaphat

The next two kings are judged righteous. The assessment of Asa (1 Kgs 15,9-15) is a model of those judgments which are positive, but tellingly qualified because of a failure to remove the high places (v. 14a). The warmth of the commendation, together with the qualification, raises the question whether any king will perfectly meet the standards by which they are being measured. There is therefore a tacit pointer to Hezekiah and Josiah — yet without revealing what the final judgment on them will be.

Jehoshaphat too is basically judged righteous (1 Kgs 22,41-44), though the note of rebuke is now somewhat stronger, leaving no doubt that the abuses allowed and perpetuated by Solomon and Rehoboam have not gone away. The story of Jehoshaphat is more intriguing than this, however. Appended to the negative part of the judgment on him is the tantalizing information that he "...also made peace with the King of Israel" (v. 44). The hint that this fact may constitute part of that negative judgment is borne out by the stories of his connivance first with Ahab, then with Ahab's son Jehoram (1 Kgs 22; 2 Kgs 3). In these stories, which have certain features in common, Jehoshaphat conducts a kind of flirtation with the north, which suggests a unity between the two kingdoms. The underlying issue in the stories is the status and destiny of Israel as a whole, the chosen people of God in their God-given territory. The unity which appears, however, is in the end mocked by the events.

The alliance formed by Jehoshaphat and Ahab illustrates the point. 1 Kgs 22,2 is one of those instances where an event is recorded which leaves the reader guessing as to motive and intention. Why did Jehoshaphat go down to the King of Israel? Neither he nor the narrator gives a clue. The reader is left to speculate about some vague sense on the southern king's part that the two should be one. It is Ahab who makes the running, with an overt appeal to the historic unity of Israel: "Ramoth-Gilead belongs to *us*", v. 3. Jehoshaphat acquiesces eagerly, in terms which recall Israel's Holy War, v. 4. The war itself is a travesty of Israel's true calling. It is waged

in the name of her rightful inheritance, yet it comes directly in the wake of Ahab's remorseless challenge to the theology of inheritance in the incident of Naboth's vineyard, when he acquiesced in the murder of his fellow-Israelite at the instigation of his more daring wife. Both kings go to war with Syria in the face of the prophetic opposition of Micaiah. If Jehoshaphat's attitude to Micaiah is less hardened than that of Ahab the southern king nevertheless goes with his ally. The denouement of the tale is close to farce, with Ahab getting his come-uppance despite his disguise, while Jehoshaphat, dressed in the kingly garb which may suggest that he of the two is the one in Israel with the true right to rule, is nevertheless unequal to the task, and in defeat, certainly no David.

In 2 Kgs 3, Jehoshaphat is once again ready to go with the northern king, though it is now Jehoram who makes the approach (v. 7). And there is a certain sense of *déjà vu*. The question of Israel's identity is again on the agenda, but now further befogged by the addition of Edom to the alliance. The pathetic confusion of the enterprise against Moab, and its mysterious and tragic end even at the moment of victory, point to a similar interpretation of this expedition as for the Syrian campaign. Israel's attempts to meet her calling fall far short of accomplishment. Judah, represented by Jehoshaphat, is fully implicated in the discomfiture of "Israel", despite Elisha's "regard" for the king (3,14). The failure of Judah to fulfil her vocation as Israel is only heightened by the formal seal of approval which is put on the reign of Jehoshaphat. With Jehoshaphat the narrative begins to suggest an identity between north and south — of character and purpose, and perhaps also of destiny.

Judah and the North

The influence of Ahab on Judah long survives his death and that of Jehoshaphat. Jehoram (note the similar name to Ahab's own son) and Ahaziah are related to Ahab via Athaliah, a "granddaughter of Omri" (2 Kgs 8,16-18,25-27); the fact is put to good account in showing that Ahab lives on in Judah. Jehoram calls forth the reminder that YHWH still shows favour to Judah for the sake of David (v. 19). Yet this, ominously, is the last such reminder (see above).

The tendency to link the stories of north and south continues with the overtures of Amaziah (a "good" king) to the northern Jehoash (2 Kgs 14), in a move that is reminiscent of Jehoshaphat, but which now ends in war between the two and defeat for Judah, a tragic outcome that seems to be the fruit of the earlier king's misguided policy. There is no wholeness in this "Israel", whether "Israel" is conceived as the twelve-tribe entity or either of the two parts into which it has split. There are, furthermore, increasing hints of similarity between the two kingdoms. Judah now apes the north in an acquired habit of assassination of the monarch (Joash, 2 Kgs 12,20-21; Amaziah, 2 Kgs 14,19). Amaziah holds Jerusalem by force from the beginning (14,5), but far from being a sufficient entitlement to the kingship, his violence merely foreshadows the way in which he himself will fall. The dynastic principle itself is under severe stress; it is no accident that this insecurity of the Davidic king is matched by the now prevailing silence in respect of the Davidic promise. More suggestively, in the continuing story of north and south, even the names of kings begin to sound alike (Jehoram/Joram, Jehoash/Joash, Jehoahaz). Finally, the appeal of Ahaz to Assyria (2 Kgs 16,7-9) is a hint that ultimate absorption by Empire is a fate that awaits not only Israel, but Judah as well.

The relation of the fate of the south to that of the north becomes the stuff of the author's reflection in 2 Kgs 17. Here, he considers the reasons for the fall of the north, and makes a telling comparison between the two kingdoms (vv. 18a.19). The theory of Cross and Nelson invites the question what part their Dtr² played in the composition of the chapter. *Ex hypothesi*, his contribution must be at a minimum vv. 18b.19, and at a maximum much or all of ch. 17. Nelson's answer is towards the maximum, thus allowing that vv. 18b.19 form an integral part of the argument of the chapter. Hobbs too sees the verses as integral, and typifying, in their context, the Old Testament's "paradigmatic" view of history, which he also finds in Micah 1 and elsewhere⁽²¹⁾. Our argument so far tends to confirm this, because of the various analogies emerging in the story between the character, and possibly destiny, of the two kingdoms. A decision whether it is appropriate to attribute the final form of the chapter to a "Dtr²" cannot be made in the context of a study of 2

(21) NELSON, *Double Redaction*, 55-63; HOBBS, *2 Kings*, 235-236.

Kgs 17 in isolation, but only as a result of an inquiry into Kings as a whole. Accordingly our study now observes a further central feature of the narrative.

Reform

Alongside the increasing moral identification of Judah with Israel is an apparently contrary trend in the story of the former, namely the movement towards Reform⁽²²⁾. The tendency which will climax in Josiah began in fact with Asa, and is taken further with Joash, whose purification of the cult seems to signal escape from the toils of the house of Ahab (in the person of Athaliah). However, even as Reform raises hopes of betterment for Judah, we are not permitted to miss the poverty of its outcome. Joash in time buys off the marauding Hazael with Temple gold, and subsequently suffers assassination. His reign is followed by that of Amaziah which sees defeat in war against the north, and will descend to the perversions of Ahaz before there will be another attempt to restore order in the Yahwistic cult. In the case of Joash, Reform is a disappointment. The question raised by his story is whether that disappointment was a function of his own personal inadequacy to the moment, while another might perform more satisfactorily; or whether there is in fact little hope of permanent betterment for Judah through reform of the cult — even if such reform *is* an absolute requirement of the deuteronomic law.

That the latter, more disturbing, scenario may be closer to the mark is suggested by the story of Hezekiah, the next king to make reforms. If Joash's Reform failed to produce the results which his obedience to the deuteronomic law might have led to expect, the same is more emphatically true of Hezekiah's. The judgment on Hezekiah, 2 Kgs 18,1-8, is positive and without reservation. Indeed,

(22) The significance of the theme has been highlighted by HOFFMANN, *Reform*, who includes under this rubric not only the Yahweh-reforms of Asa through to Josiah, but also "reforms" in favour of religion centred elsewhere than in Jerusalem, and mainly focussed on Baal. In this way, Jeroboam and Ahab become "reformers" too. The following observations are broadly in agreement with Hoffmann's analysis, though they were arrived at independently.

there was none like him either before or after (v. 5). The Reform trend is therefore intensifying. The immediate sequel to vv. 1-8, then, takes us aback. It records again the fall of Samaria to Shalmaneser, only to hasten on to Sennacherib's invasion of Judah. The notice of Hezekiah's exemplariness, therefore, is followed by the opposite of what it might have been expected to produce, namely loss of land and a parlous situation for the kingdom, which results in Hezekiah's vassaldom, a status bought with Temple gold. There are echoes of Joash here. Yet the contrast between the king's performance and its outcome is starker, because the fall from grace is not, apparently, precipitated by anything in the king.

The Hezekiah story contains further surprises. It is only after Hezekiah, reduced to helplessness by the Assyrian, pays tribute (18,14b), that an oracle of deliverance for Judah comes, 20,6b (though it is a more direct result of the Rabshakeh's direct challenge to the power of YHWH, and Hezekiah's own resort to prayer). It is the sequel to the oracle that is most surprising, however, for, in the context of Hezekiah's preoccupation with his personal health and safety, and his incaution in relation to the Babylonian embassy, the promise of deliverance is quickly transmuted into a prediction of downfall at the hands of that power⁽²³⁾. How far Hezekiah's own selfish concerns were formative of the events related does not emerge clearly. But the narrative does not want us to miss the contrasts it sets forth: the contrast between the formal report on Hezekiah's life and his actual bearing under pressure, and the sharp reverse that occurs between the oracle of deliverance and the oracle that promises demise. The question whether any king in Jerusalem can usher in permanent salvation is by this stage very urgent.

(23) NELSON, *Double Redaction*, 129, has argued for the integrity of the account of the Babylonian embassy (2 Kgs 20,12-19) on the grounds that it shows no indication of being "... secondary to its context of similar prophet narratives". He salvages it for his Josianic Dtr¹ by arguing that it is not in fact a *vaticinium ex eventu*, being insufficiently detailed, but that it merely warns of the dangers of an alliance with Babylon (129-132). My concern is not with whether the account is a *vaticinium ex eventu*, but that it is integrally related to the conclusion of DtH. Cf. also HOBBS, *2 Kings*, 287-288, on the integrity of vv. 12-19, and his argument for the parallel between the extension of Judah's days implied in the account and the extension of the life of Hezekiah, vv. 1-11.

The aftermath of Hezekiah's reign is that of Manasseh, presented as the most wicked of the kings of Judah. Furthermore, he is carefully depicted as undoing the good that had been done by Hezekiah's Reform, and as re-introducing the influence of Ahab in the south (v. 3). He is at once a postscript to Hezekiah and a prelude to the story of Josiah. His story is anticipatory in the sense that it seals Judah's fate before Josiah is even brought on stage. The present status of the promise to David and Solomon is made clear by its very reiteration in such a way as to show that it is now compromised (vv. 7-9). And the verdict is followed by the sentence: "... I will stretch over Jerusalem the measuring-line of Samaria and the plummet of the house of Ahab..." (v. 13). Manasseh therefore brings to a climax that trend in the narrative of Kings which has been ominous for the future of Judah.

With Josiah, the contrary trend, namely the movement towards Reform, comes in turn to its greatest hour. Josiah's Reform surpasses all previous efforts. It is the fulfilment of the prophecy against Bethel made to Jeroboam (23,15, cf. 1 Kgs 13,2); it involves a reclamation, at least symbolically, of the full extent of the ancient promised land, and consequently a defiance of the Imperial power, submission to which had bedevilled the earlier Reforms (23,19,20); it involves a Passover such as has not been kept since the days of the judges (23,22). Josiah is, in short, the greatest king since David; in execution of his royal duties according to deuteronomic expectation he leaves nothing to be desired (23,25). When, therefore, this circumstantial account of the excellences of Josiah is followed abruptly by the notice that, nevertheless, the sentence on Judah uttered over Manasseh still stands (vv. 26,27), it comes as something of a shock. The attractiveness of the two-author theory could not be more evident than at this point, and indeed these verses (vv. 25-27) are crucial to it.

However, with Hoffmann and T. R. Hobbs, I believe that the narrative of Josiah's reign has to be read in the light of a pattern which is by now well established⁽²⁴⁾. Vv. 25-27 are in fact insufficient in themselves as a basis for a theory of two authors. Such a theory can only stand if it can be supported by propositions about the whole tendency of the narrative to this point. Without overtly

(24) HOBBS, *2 Kings*, 321.

considering the nature of the narrative in Kings, Cross made such a proposition, namely: "Before the pericope on Manasseh [viz. 2 Kgs 21,2-15] there is no hint in the Deuteronomistic history that hope in the Davidic house and in ultimate national salvation is futile"⁽²⁵⁾. It has been the aim of this article (within the limits of its scope) to pick out more carefully the path through Kings which relates expressly to the fate of Judah. The reading offered presents, I believe, a challenge to the affirmation of Cross just quoted. Far from leading the reader consistently to expect salvation for Judah through a Davidic king, it leads him rather to expect the opposite. With the reforming kings there was an intensifying insistence that Reform did not in fact produce the desired results. We observed the surprising sequence of events in the account of Hezekiah. It is as if there are more and more violent swings between hope produced by the commendation of a king and new despair as the fortunes of the kingdom sink to further low points⁽²⁶⁾. As Asa and Joash led in time to Ahaz, so Hezekiah gave way to Manasseh. Nor is the discrepancy between the promise made to David about his sons and the actual course of events a new feature of the narrative with the accounts of the reforming kings. The note of ambiguity in relation to the kings in Jerusalem was there, as we saw, from Solomon and Rehoboam on. On a wider canvas, it was prepared for in the coolness of Judges about kings, and in the ideological rejection of kingship in 1 Sam 8-12.

On such a reading the failure of Josiah to usher in a period of salvation for Judah is no surprise. If the manner of its telling startles because of the sharp incongruity between high hope and inevitable condemnation, that too has been prepared for by the narrative's consistent use of the ironic, the unexpected, the ominous detail, throughout. The appeal to the wickedness of Manasseh *behind*, as it were, the excellent Josiah has the effect of finally ruling out the possibility that salvation for Judah can be expected through *any* king. Furthermore, the fate of Josiah himself cannot be isolated from the pervasive tone of the narrative which we have observed. His ill-

⁽²⁵⁾ CROSS, *Myth*, 284-285. LOHFINK, *Deuteronomium*, 44, is equally categorical that vv. 26-27 cannot be from the same hand as v. 25.

⁽²⁶⁾ HOFFMANN, *Reform*, 154-155, describes this effect as increasingly violent pendulum-swings, and compares the gathering momentum towards the double climax with an operatic finale.

conceived mission to stop Pharaoh Neco, and the unexpected manner of his death in view of the prophecy of Huldah which promised that he would come to his grave "in peace" (22,18-20), strike a note of puzzlement reminiscent of the non-sequiturs which characterised the account of Hezekiah⁽²⁷⁾. Neither the optimism of Cross's Dtr¹ nor the incompetence of his Dtr² can really be found here⁽²⁸⁾.

The Meaning of Kings

If we have thus argued for a unified conception in the Books of Kings, with its consequence of a single final author in the exilic period⁽²⁹⁾, it remains to ask what the purpose of the narrative might have been. It is no longer possible to rest content with Noth's belief that DtH merely explained why the kingdom had fallen. There is much in Kings that expresses a theology of grace, and that in itself leaves a door ajar for some new thing to happen in the relationship between God and his chosen people. The point is explicit in Solomon's prayer at 1 Kgs 8,46-53, which, as we have noted, places no weight on the dynastic promise, but harks back to the ancient deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and to the concept of election. Grace as a theme, however, has also emerged in some of the features of the narrative which we have observed. In the very refusal of the narrative to follow the courses we might have expected it to follow, the point has unavoidably been conveyed that God cannot be ma-

⁽²⁷⁾ HOFFMANN, *Reform*, 181-187, believes that the account of Josiah's death is consistent with Huldah's oracle, which promises only that he will be *gathered to his grave* "in peace", and implies nothing about a peaceful death.

⁽²⁸⁾ Hobbs is right, I believe, in opposing Nelson's argument that the regnal formulae alter significantly for the kings after Josiah; NELSON, *Double Redaction*, 29-42; HOBBS, *2 Kings*, 346.

⁽²⁹⁾ In spite of the position-statement in n. 8, and for reasons of scope, the present treatment makes no claims or assumptions about the use of historical sources, or what they might have contained. It allows for the probability, however, that the final author used material that derived from periods close to the events described. It is even possible that the theological/ideological point of view which he expresses was inherited from predecessors within a tradition of covenantal interpretation of the course of Israel's history. This view is in sharp contrast to HOFFMANN's belief that Dtr used few sources; e.g. *Reform*, 126.

nipulated. The story of Hezekiah is a case in point, where Reform does not automatically bring salvation. Conversely, YHWH's intervention for salvation in the reigns of Jehoahaz and Jeroboam II of Israel (2 Kgs 13; 14) is not motivated by any righteousness on the part of the two kings, though Jehoahaz does appeal in desperation for deliverance from the enemy (13,4). In his case YHWH's intervention resembles his interventions in the time of the judges (note the "saviour", *môshia'*, v. 5). With Jeroboam the reason for salvation is simply, and very generally, YHWH's promised commitment to Israel (14,27).

* * *

What kind of hope, then, does the narrator offer to his readers? The release of Jehoiachin is not strong enough to bear hopes of restoration in itself. Our narrator's understanding of Israel's history thus far hardly prepares the reader to think that all will be set to rights by the restoration of a Davidic monarch. In the end Kings can only be understood when placed alongside Judges. Following Webb's study of Judges it is clear that the old tendency to contrast Judges and Kings (as in von Rad's understanding of the cycles of apostasy, judgment, repentance and deliverance as against the inexorable downward spiral in Kings⁽³⁰⁾) is wide of the mark. Judges has its own kind of downward spiral⁽³¹⁾. There are in fact marked similarities between the two works. Judges puts question-marks against Israel's real possession of the land it occupied; so does Kings, as we have seen, for example, in the cases of Solomon, and Ahab/Jehoshaphat. Judges finishes on a note which suggests that Israel exercises an increasingly tenuous hold on the land, and only in spite of her chronic failures. This is hardly in severe tension with Kings. Kings itself knows of a land held only by grace (cf. above on Jeroboam II). And the ominous tone that the narratives can have (both in Judges and in Kings) has meaning only if there is a real possibility that the land can in reality be lost altogether. Judges and Kings can in fact be seen as mirror-images of each other. In Judges, the land is held

⁽³⁰⁾ G. VON RAD, *Old Testament Theology I* (Edinburgh - London 1962) 347.

⁽³¹⁾ WEBB, *Judges*, 112.

but *might* be lost; in Kings, the land is lost, but some measure of restoration is a possibility.

This last statement requires some elaboration. Kings allows for hope that exile might not be God's final word to his people. The most important indication of this is Solomon's anticipation that, even in exile they might turn back to YHWH in penitence, and his prayer that he might hear their supplication, maintain their cause, forgive their sin, and grant them compassion in the sight of their captors (1 Kgs 8,46-51). The people's repentance is clearly an important precondition of salvation⁽³²⁾. Less directly, 2 Kgs 17 also suggests the possibility of restoration, because of its extended treatment of the opportunity of the *new* inhabitants of the northern territory to embrace Yahwism — an opportunity which may be read as continuing "to this day" (17,24-41). Neither of these places, however, openly envisages the restoration of exiles from Judah to their land. Indeed, neither on this point nor on the *manner* in which repentance might be achieved has Kings as much to say as Deuteronomy. Deut 30 anticipates not merely compassion on the part of those who hold the people captive, but actual release and restoration to the land. This is accompanied in the same place by an understanding that the kind of repentance which would be an adequate condition of such restoration would be a work of YHWH himself (Deut 30,6). The question why the author of Kings does not adopt the solution offered by Deuteronomy is beyond the scope of the present inquiry. That solution is in fact taken up and developed in Jeremiah's Book of Consolation⁽³³⁾. For the author of the Books of Kings, whether conversant with Deuteronomy's solution or not, the occasion was not right for such a doctrine.

Trinity College
Bristol BS9 1JP
Great Britain

J. G. McCONVILLE

⁽³²⁾ Cf. H.-W. WOLFF, "The Kerygma of the Deuteronomistic Historical Work", *ZAW* 73 (1961) 171-186.

⁽³³⁾ I hope to develop this in a forthcoming study of Jeremiah and the deuteronomistic literature.

SOMMAIRE

Cet article soutient que les livres des Rois contiennent un message unifié. Leurs qualités littéraires et l'usage d'un certain nombre de schèmes dans leur structure en révèlent partiellement le sens. Ce genre d'enquête peut affecter les conclusions qui ont trait aux questions d'auteur et de milieu d'origine.

1-2 Rois expriment une certaine perplexité à propos de l'identité d'Israël et l'attente créée par la promesse dynastique faite à David ne fait que l'accroître. La mention d'une tendance à la réforme, en fait, ne donne jamais naissance à un réel espoir que le salut puisse venir de la dynastie davidique. Cette mention a plutôt un côté ironique. Par ailleurs, l'espoir en une action future de Dieu en faveur d'Israël n'est pas absent, mais il est informe et lourd de questions.

Rethinking Covenant in Late Biblical Books

Scholars have long debated the antiquity of the biblical conception that Israel was related to Yahweh by a conditional covenant⁽¹⁾ according to which fidelity to the god would be rewarded and infidelity severely punished⁽²⁾. In a recent monograph, *God and His People*, Ernest Nicholson, provides an excellent summary of a century of research into biblical covenant⁽³⁾. Although Nicholson's book gives the impression of finality, most readers are likely to agree with Mays that "the issues posed by Wellhausen have been posed anew for discussion, but the issues are not settled; they have been simply reopened"⁽⁴⁾.

(1) For a recent survey of the varieties of divine-human covenant in the Bible see F. Bruce, *apud* H. ORLINSKY, "The Biblical Concept of the Land of Israel: Cornerstone of the Covenant between God and Israel", *ErIsr* 18 (1985) 53*, n. 4. On the retention of "covenant" as a translation of Hebrew ברית, see J. BARR, "Some Semantic Notes on the Covenant", *Beiträge zur Alttestamentlichen Theologie* (FS. W. Zimmerli; [H. DONNER, R. HANHART and R. SMEND, eds.] Göttingen 1977) 36; D. MCCARTHY, "Covenant Relationships", in *id.*, *Institution and Narrative. Collected Essays* (Rome 1985) 54, n. 1.

(2) In itself the presentation of binary alternatives is no indication of early or late date. The epilogues to the Holiness Code (Lev 26,3-45) and to Deuteronomy (Deut 28,1-48) are nicely paralleled in the epilogue to Hammurapi's laws in their use of binary alternatives. See B. LEVINE, "The Epilogue to the Holiness Code: A Priestly Statement on the Destiny of Israel", *Judaic Perspectives on Ancient Israel* (J. NEUSNER, B. LEVINE and E. FREDRICHs, eds.) (Philadelphia 1987) 22.

(3) E. NICHOLSON, *God and His People. Covenant and Theology in the Old Testament* (Oxford 1986); and more briefly, *id.*, "Covenant in a Century of Study since Wellhausen", *OTS* 24 (1986) 54-69. See further the review of *God and His People* by J. L. MAYS, *JBL* 107 (1988) 119-120. For an earlier survey see K. BALTZER, *The Covenant Formulary in Old Testament, Jewish and Early Christian Writings* (Philadelphia 1971) 1-8.

(4) MAYS, *JBL* 107 (1988) 120.

The present paper reopens the issue of covenant in the exilic and post-exilic periods. One brief preliminary remark is in order: The respective advocates of early and late dates for conditional national covenant have agreed in construing ברית with Yahweh as a monotheistic metaphor. Mendenhall once wrote: "The population of the twelve tribes were predominantly native Palestinians who had *converted*⁽⁵⁾ to *monotheism* [emphasis added] under the covenant with Yahweh"⁽⁶⁾. Weinfeld, like Mendenhall an advocate of an early date, has termed covenant a "perfect metaphor" for loyalty in a monotheistic religion, claiming that the notion was unique to Israel⁽⁷⁾. In fact, there is no necessary connection between divine-human covenant and monotheism. It may be argued that if biblical covenant owes anything at all to political models, then we would expect the opposite to be the case. The multiplicity of political entities was what required the making of covenants. Covenant in religious imagery reflects a like multiplicity of divine entities. Indeed, texts in Phoenician and Akkadian show that the language of divine-human covenant and alliance was employed in religious imagery in polytheistic cultures outside of Israel⁽⁸⁾. The biblical writers surely knew that one might covenant with other gods than Yahweh, hence the prohibition: "You shall not make a

(5) The very possibility of religious conversion in pre-exilic Israel has been denied by J. MILGROM, "Religious Conversion and the Revolt Model for the Formation of Israel", *JBL* 101 (1982) 169-176. Cf. the rejoinder by N. GOTTWALD, "Religious Conversion and the Societal Origins of Ancient Israel", forthcoming in an issue of *Perspectives in Religious Studies* honoring Walter Harrelson on the occasion of his retirement. (I am extremely grateful to Professor Gottwald for providing me with a pre-publication copy of his manuscript.)

(6) G. MENDENHALL, "'Change and Decay in All Around I See': Conquest, Covenant, and *The Tenth Generation*", *BA* 39 (1976) 156. Cf. id., "Biblical History in Transition", *The Bible and the Ancient Near East* (G. E. WRIGHT ed.) (Garden City 1965) 40.

(7) M. WEINFELD, "Berith", *TDOT* II, 278. Contrast S. D. SPERLING, "An Arslan Tash Incantation: Interpretations and Implications", *HUCA* 53 (1982) 9, n. 70.

(8) For references, see S. D. SPERLING, "Israel's Religion in the Ancient Near East", *Jewish Spirituality from the Bible to the Middle Ages* (A. GREEN ed.) (New York 1986) 24-25. In addition, note the prediction: *ilū EN.MEŠ SILIM-mi-šū* "the gods will be his allies", cited in *CAD* S, 103 b.

covenant with them (the inhabitants of the land) or with their gods" (Exod 23,22)⁽⁹⁾.

The objection to linking covenant and monotheism is even stronger when applied to Wellhausen and more recent scholars who argued that the conditional covenant between Yahweh and Israel was the late⁽¹⁰⁾ legalistic expression of the originally prophetic teaching of ethical monotheism. Were the argument well-founded, we should expect late biblical writings that are clearly monotheistic and at the same time enthusiastic about law to emphasize the conditional covenant between Yahweh and Israel. The present paper examines בְּרִית in biblical texts of unquestionably late date⁽¹¹⁾ to demonstrate instead that at least as regards conditional covenant, we must agree with Noth "that in the late Old Testament literature the word 'covenant' (used in the figurative sense of the relationship between God and the people) was emptied of all its meaning⁽¹²⁾". It is therefore understandable that the author of Ps 119 who surely loved the law and the commandments found no use for בְּרִית in 176 verses⁽¹³⁾. Of even more importance is the way in which בְּרִית is treated in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah,

(9) It must be emphasized that the conditional "Mosaic" covenants in the Pentateuch and the covenant of Joshua 24 insist that Israelites must worship Yahweh exclusively (monolatry) but do not insist that Yahweh is the only god in existence (monotheism). As most graphically put by A. EHRlich, *Mikrâ Ki-Pshutô*, I (Reprint; New York 1969) 172: "From this verse (Exod 20:5), we derive that the earliest worshippers of Yahweh did not claim that the other gods were insubstantial, for if that were the case, how would we construe Yahweh's jealousy of other gods? After all, no man gets jealous towards his wife on account of a eunuch". For monolatry in Israel and elsewhere in the ancient Near East see A. VAN SELMS, "Temporary Henotheism", *Symbolae Biblicae et Mesopotamicae* (FS. F. de Liagre Böhl; [M. BEEK-A. KAMPEN, eds.] Leiden 1973) 341-348.

(10) See especially, A. JEPSEN, "Berith — Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Exilszeit", *Verbannung und Heimkehr* (FS. W. Rudolph; [ed. A. KUSCHKE] Tübingen 1961) 161-169; L. PERLITT, *Bundestheologie im Alten Testament* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1969); E. KUTSCH, *Verheissung und Gesetz* (Berlin-New York 1973).

(11) For a recent study with different results, cf. D. MCCARTHY, "Covenant and Law in Chronicles-Nehemiah", *CBQ* 44 (1982) 25-44, reprinted in id., *Institution and Narrative*, 92-111.

(12) M. NOTH, *The Laws in the Pentateuch and Other Studies* (Philadelphia 1967) 93.

(13) Cf. BARR, "Some Semantic Notes", 34.

which are generally considered the epitome of the monotheistic exclusiveness of Palestinian Judaism in the fifth-fourth pre-Christian centuries⁽¹⁴⁾. In Ezra-Nehemiah we find an insistence on the binding character of the law, on its punctilious observance and on the separation of Jews from Gentiles. The term ברית is attested five times in all in Ezra-Nehemiah.

In Ezra 10,3 some Jews approach Ezra to confess their⁽¹⁵⁾ sinfulness in taking gentile wives. In a penitent mood they resolve on a covenant (נכרת ברית לאלהינו) to divorce these women and to oust any children born of the sinful unions. Ezra (10,5) then places all the leading priests and Levites and all of Israel under oath (וישבוע) to do what they have resolved. An announcement is made that in three days' time an assembly of all the exilic returnees will be convened for the purpose of dealing with the intermarriages. Excommunication (יכירל) from the community and confiscation (יחרם) of property are threatened for all who fail to attend. In his study of the pericope McCarthy⁽¹⁶⁾ correctly noted that "the addition of *hišbi'a* (v. 5) to *kārat berit* (v. 3) is unnecessary", without realizing the full significance of his observation. Simply stated, the pleonasm indicates that *kārat berit* in this pericope has lost its earlier precise technical sense. It is rather, the oath which gives binding force to the community's action. We may note further the absence both of ceremonial cursing and rituals involving animals such as are found in indubitably pre-exilic covenants within⁽¹⁷⁾ and without the Bible. Instead, a commission is established to examine the marriages case by case (Ezra 10,14-17).

That conditional ברית has lost its technical significance may be readily seen by examining Nehemiah's prayer in Neh 1,5-11. In v. 5, ברית occurs in a borrowing from Deut 7,9 in a string of divine epithets: יהוה אלהי השמים שמר הברית וחסד לאהביו ולשמרי מצותיו "Yahweh God

(¹⁴) It is now clear that the insistence on purity, separation from foreigners and re-establishment of traditional religious observances during the Persian period were values not unique to the Jews. See J. BLENKINSOPP, "The Mission of Udjahorresnet and Those of Ezra and Nehemiah", *JBL* 106 (1987) 409-421.

(¹⁵) The speaker is Shechaniah b. Jehiel of the sons of Elam. His father is specifically named as one who had brought home a gentile wife in Ezra 10,26.

(¹⁶) MCCARTHY "Covenant and Law", 33.

(¹⁷) See e.g. Jer 34,8-22.

of heaven, the God great and fearful, keeper of the⁽¹⁸⁾ covenantal loyalty to those who love him and keep his commandments". Nehemiah then confesses the sins of Israel as well as those of himself and his family in v. 7-9:

We have acted wrongfully (חבלנו) and not observed the commandments (מצות) statutes, (חקים) and rules (משפטים) with which you charged (צוית) Moses your servant. Remember the word (הדבר) you gave⁽¹⁹⁾ (צוית) your servant Moses: 'Just you be unfaithful (אתם תמעלו), I will scatter you among the peoples. But just you return to me (ושבתם אלי) and carefully observe my commandments (ושמרתם מצותי ועשיתם אתם), then even if your dispersed are at the ends of heaven (בקצה השמים) I will gather them from there and bring them to the temple⁽²⁰⁾ wherein I have chosen to establish my name.

Ginsberg has observed of Nehemiah "that the only Torah he reflects when he prays or wishes to speak quasi-biblically is Deuteronomy"⁽²¹⁾. It is, therefore, noteworthy that although Nehemiah's confession employs deuteronomic language⁽²²⁾, there is no mention of the sin of covenant violation foreseen in Deuteronomy⁽²³⁾. It is even more remarkable that in v. 8, where ברית would have been the natural choice, the writer employed דבר instead.

The use of ברית is even more striking in Nehemiah 9⁽²⁴⁾. Although ברית occurs twice in the chapter (vv. 8,32), the term is avoided just where in deuteronomic writing it would have been an excel-

⁽¹⁸⁾ LXX (2 Esdras 11,5) Φυλάσσωσιν τὴν διαθήκην καὶ τὸ ἔλεος reflects the definite article just as in Deut 7,9.

⁽¹⁹⁾ For the various senses "give", "commission", "designate", "assign" of Heb צוה see J. HOFSTIJZER, *Die Verheissungen an die drei Erzväter* (Leiden 1956) 75, n. 24. Hofstijzer's observations undermine Weinfeld's defense of KUTSCH, *TDOT*, 255, that the association of ברית and צוה requires the abandonment of the translation "covenant" in favor of "obligation".

⁽²⁰⁾ That is surely what "the place" (המקום) must mean here. Cf. Deut 12,5.11.14.26; 16,2.6.7.11.15.

⁽²¹⁾ H. L. GINSBERG, *The Israelian Heritage of Judaism* (New York 1982) 18.

⁽²²⁾ Cf. v. 9 with Deut 12,11; 16,2; 30,3-4; see further, M. FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation in Ancient Israel* (Oxford 1985) 471, n. 34.

⁽²³⁾ E.g. Deut 17,2; 31,16.20; Cf. also 1 Kgs 19,10.

⁽²⁴⁾ On the chapter in general with references to earlier literature see S. MOWINCKEL, *Studien zu dem Buche Ezra-Nehemiah*, I (Oslo 1964) 50-61. Mowinckel attributes the chapter to a late redactor.

lent choice. Chapter nine depicts the penitent Jewish community listening to a public reading of the law and a confessional review of Israel's history, in which, as usual, Yahweh's mighty deeds are contrasted to Israel's stubbornness. Yahweh is described as sole creator of all the heavens, of the heavenly host, of the earth and the seas. He gives life to all and the heavenly host all worship him. This same Yahweh:

chose Abram... found him faithful and made that covenant with him (וכרות עמו הברית לתת את ארץ הכנעני... לירעו) to give the land⁽²⁵⁾ of the Canaanites... to his seed. You fulfilled your words (דבריד) because you are righteous (6-8).

The history continues with the wondrous exodus and the deliverance at the sea and then proceeds to the gift of the law:

You descended on Mount Sinai, speaking with them from heaven. You gave them right rules (ותתן להם משפטים ישרים) reliable teachings (תורות) (אמת), and worthwhile statutes and commandments (חקים ומצות טובים). And your holy Sabbath you proclaimed to them. Commandments, statutes and the law (תורה) you ordained for them (צוית) through your servant Moses (8-9).

The writer then recounts the wilderness wandering and the conquest of the land. He summarizes Israel's continued stubbornness and its consequent divine punishment continuing into the present, mitigated only by Yahweh's mercy. In this long and detailed account the writer employs ברית once more (v. 32), in a manner similar to what we encountered in Neh 1,5:

Now, our God, the great mighty and fearful God, keeper of the covenantal loyalty (שומר הברית והחסד)⁽²⁶⁾ let not appear to you insignificant the hardship that has befallen us, our kings, our princes, our priests, our ancestors, and all your people, from the days of the kings of Assyria until this very day.

⁽²⁵⁾ On the intimate connection between covenant and land see ORLINSKY, "Biblical Concept", 43*-55*.

⁽²⁶⁾ We translate the term as a hendiadys in which חסד serves adjectivally. See M. WEINFELD, "הברית והחסד- המונחים וגלגולי התפתחותם בישראל ובעולם העתיק", *Leš* 36 (1971-72) 85. The Greek (2 Esdras 19,32) translation: φυλάσσωσιν τὴν διαθήκην σου καὶ τὸ ἐλεός σου, reflects *Heb: שמר בריתך וחסדך.

The source of שומר הברית והחסד in Nehemiah 9 is, once more, Deut 7,9⁽²⁷⁾. According to Deut 7,8-9, Yahweh brought the exodus generation out of Egypt on two accounts. First, because he loved them (מאהבת יהוה אתכם) and second, because he observed the oath (השבעה) that he had long before made to their ancestors. The exodus proved that Yahweh was the "divine faithful keeper of the covenantal loyalty (האל הנאמן שמר הברית והחסד לאהביו ולשמרי מצותו לאלף דור) for a thousand generations of (descendants) of those who love him, and keep his commandments". The reference, those "who love him and keep his commandments", is to the ancestors, who according to tradition found elsewhere in the Pentateuch, already kept the law⁽²⁸⁾. The tradition is fully consonant with the deuteronomic notion that human love for God is a love that can be commanded, and therefore that keeping the commandments proves one's love of God⁽²⁹⁾. Had the ancestors not demonstrated that they loved Yahweh and kept his commandments, their descendants would not have been redeemed. The moral is stated in v. 11: "You (the descendants) shall keep the commandment and the statutes and the customary laws which I command you this day to perform". That שומר הברית והחסד in Deut 7,9 is conditional, is conclusively demonstrated by Deut 7,12, which reads: "If you obey these rules and keep them faithfully (ועשיתם) Yahweh your God will keep with you that covenantal loyalty (אתם ושמרתם) (ושמר... לך את הברית ואת החסד) which he swore to your ancestors". In other words, the covenantal loyalty sworn to the ancestors was conditional. For that covenantal loyalty to remain in force, the descendants must emulate their ancestors⁽³⁰⁾. It is of interest that

⁽²⁷⁾ The term occurs again in 1 Kgs 8,23 = 1 Chr 6,14 and Dan 9,4. In 1 Kgs 8,23 = 1 Chr 6,14, the beneficiaries of Yahweh's "covenantal loyalty" are David's descendants. Cf. J. GRAY, *I & II Kings A Commentary* (Philadelphia 1976) 220. Gray translates "loyal love"; For previous studies of שומר הברית, see WEINFELD, *Leš* 36, 85-105; KUTSCH, *Verheissung*, 122-123.

⁽²⁸⁾ See especially Gen 26,5; cf. HOFMEIER, *Verheissungen*, 49. The anachronistic notion is no stranger than Noah's distinction between clean and unclean animals (Gen 7,2.8.20).

⁽²⁹⁾ E.g. Deut 10,12-13; 11,1.22, 13,4-5; 19,9; 30,16; cf. 1 John 5,2-3. See W. MORAN, "The Ancient Near Eastern Background of the Love of God in Deuteronomy", *CBQ* 25 (1963) 78. See further, M. NOTH, *Exodus* (Philadelphia 1962) 163.

⁽³⁰⁾ Indeed, as Deut 7,10 makes clear, Yahweh's "enemies", meaning those who do not show their love by keeping his commandments, will be

other late texts dependent on Deut 7,9 preserve the restriction of divine covenantal loyalty to "those who love him and keep his commandments"⁽³¹⁾. In contrast, Neh 9,32 quotes only *שומר הברית והחסד*, but not the restriction⁽³²⁾. Significant as well is the writer's placement of *שומר הברית והחסד* at the point where it frames the chapter's summary of Israelite history, which had begun with the *ברית* made with Abraham in 9,8. It will be observed that by associating the Abrahamic *ברית* with the change of Abram's name to Abraham, Neh 9,8 recalls the covenant of Gen 17,8 (P), according to which the land was promised in perpetuity (*לאחוזת עולם*) and unconditionally. The formula, *שומר הברית והחסד* at the end of the summary of Israel's history, thus serves to reinforce Neh 9,8 by recalling the unconditional *ברית* rather than its conditional versions. Because Nehemiah 9 speaks only of an unconditional ancestral covenant⁽³³⁾, we do not find violation of the covenant among the details of Israel's sins. Thus, according to v. 16, the Israelites have been "malicious" (*לוא שמעו*)⁽³⁴⁾, "stiff-necked" (*ויקשו את ערפם*) "disobedient" (*החידו*)⁽³⁵⁾. They are not accused of transgressing a covenant despite the fact that the writer of the chapter surely had access to earlier passages in which the notion occurs, especially in Deuteronomy⁽³⁵⁾.

The final occurrence of *ברית* in Ezra-Nehemiah is in 13,28-29. Certain priests and Levites who have taken gentile wives are accused of being "contaminators of the priesthood and the covenant of the

immediately requited with destruction, despite Yahweh's earlier oath to their ancestors.

⁽³¹⁾ In 1 Kgs 8,23 (=2 Chr 6,14) Yahweh's covenantal loyalty is limited to "your servants who served you whole-heartedly". Dan 9,4, in the manner of Neh 1,5, simply borrows "those who love him and keep his commandments" from Deut 7,9.

⁽³²⁾ The writer of Jon 4,2 employed the same technique in omitting "he does not remit all punishment" from his quotation of the formula of Exod 34,7. Cf. Y. KAUFMANN, *The Religion of Israel* (Chicago 1960) 285.

⁽³³⁾ Cf. Deut 4,31: "He will not forget the covenant which he made under oath with your ancestors". The verse is universally regarded as part of the latest additions to Deuteronomy; cf. further the line in Jehosaphat's prayer (2 Chr 20,7): "Surely, you our God dispossessed the inhabitants of this land in behalf of your people Israel and gave it forever (*לעולם*) to the descendants of Abraham your friend".

⁽³⁴⁾ Cf. v. 29. The writer pointedly employs the same verb which he had applied to the Egyptians in v. 10.

⁽³⁵⁾ See above, n. 23.

priests and Levites" (גאלי הכהנה וברית הכהנה והלויים)⁽³⁶⁾. This appears to be a special covenant between Yahweh and the clergy, related to the ברית of the Levite priests in Jer 33,21; the ברית הלוי of Mal 2,8 (cf. 2,4,5) and the ברית כהנת עולם given Phineas and his descendants (Num 25,12)⁽³⁷⁾.

Perhaps most instructive for the whole matter of ברית in Ezra-Nehemiah is the account of the written assent by the Jews to "join with their noble brothers, and take an oath with sanctions (באים באלה ובשבועה) to follow the law of God, given through Moses the servant of God and to observe carefully all the commandments of Yahweh our lord, his rules and laws" (Neh 10,30). The written assent itself is described (10,1) by the phrase: כרתים אמנה, best translated as "we make a pledge"⁽³⁸⁾. Although the vocable אמנה⁽³⁹⁾ occurs in the Bible again only in Neh 11,23⁽⁴⁰⁾, its meaning is clear from the many attestations in Mishnaic and Talmudic Hebrew. In the Mishnah (Sotah 9:12), אנשי אמנה are "trustworthy individuals"⁽⁴¹⁾. In the Babylonian Talmud, אמנה is attested as a legal term for "loan deed of trust"⁽⁴²⁾. In the Palestinian Talmud⁽⁴³⁾ שטר אמנה is associated with שטר פיסטים (Greek: πύστις), "assurance", "pledge of good

⁽³⁶⁾ On the passage see GINSBERG, *Israelian Heritage*, 8.

⁽³⁷⁾ Cf. NOTH, *Laws*, 94; KUTSCH, *Verheissung*, 118-121. It is uncertain whether Deut 33,9 refers to the specific Levite covenant or to the zealous adherence of the Levites to the Israelite covenant.

⁽³⁸⁾ There is no basis for McCarthy's statement that, "amānā is an excellent surrogate for the usual berit" ("Covenant and Law", 34, n. 22).

⁽³⁹⁾ According to J. C. L. GIBSON, *Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions*, II (Oxford 1975) 66, *w'mn krt by* is to be read in 11. 11-12 of the Hadad inscription. GIBSON, *ibid.*, 67, translates: "and a sure covenant struck with me".

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Possibly the word vocalized 'emunā in 2 Kgs 12,16, 22,7 is identical to 'amanā. Note the defective writing 'mnh in 2 Kgs 12,16. Cf. M. WEINFELD, "The Covenant of Grant in the Old Testament and in the Ancient Near East", *JAOS* 90 (1970) 191, n. 58.

⁽⁴¹⁾ For similar usage in the midrash Mekilta see N. COHEN, "Analysis of the Exegetic Tradition in the Mekhilta de-Rabbi Ishmael: The Meaning of 'Amanah' in the Second and Third Centuries", *AJS Review* 9 (1984) 1-25.

⁽⁴²⁾ See e.g. b Baba Batra 48b: According to R. Nahman, witnesses who signed a loan-deed were not believed if they testified: אמנה היו דברינו that is, if they claimed signing the document without actually witnessing the loan, in the belief that it would later be made.

⁽⁴³⁾ Ketubot 26b.

faith”⁽⁴⁴⁾. Indeed the LXX⁽⁴⁵⁾ to Neh 10,1 translates אַמְנָה by πίσ-
τος.

The author of Nehemiah 10 avoided ברית in its formal classical sense and thus ignored the conditional national covenant so graphically described in Deuteronomy⁽⁴⁶⁾, in favor of the allegedly older⁽⁴⁷⁾ unconditional covenant by which Yahweh had given the land to Abraham in perpetuity. The formal sense of ברית is likewise avoided in descriptions of divine law in Ezra-Nehemiah. In contrast to the pre-exilic Israelites, the exilic and post-exilic Jews did not view law as primarily a matter of adherence to the covenant, but as an entity in its own right. Accordingly, when chapter 9 speaks of the law, ברית is conspicuously absent. Thus, Yahweh “gave (וַתֵּן) right rulings and teachings” (v. 13), “proclaimed (וַתְּדַבֵּר) the Sabbath”, and “ordained/prescribed (וַתִּצְוֶה) commandments, statutes and law” (v. 14).

The same ideology is summarized in the injunction at the end of Malachi (3,22): “Be mindful of the Torah of Moses my servant, to whom I assigned (וַתִּצְוֶה) at Horeb⁽⁴⁸⁾ statutes and rules for all Israel”⁽⁴⁹⁾. By the post-exilic period the “law stood upon its own feet as an independent entity”⁽⁵⁰⁾. Its statutes were binding because the sole God of monotheistic Judaism had given them to his people at Horeb through the agency of Moses. It must be emphasized that the independence of law represents not the triumph of “legalism”

⁽⁴⁴⁾ The less-than-formal sense of אַמְנָה survives in contemporary Israeli usage where the term refers to a financial agreement entered into by a couple who do not wish to marry officially according to orthodox Jewish law.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ 2 Esdras 19,20; Cf. Peshitta: יָמִין בְּשֵׁרָא “We swear in truth”.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ E.g. Deut 8,18; 9,9.11.15; 17,2; 29,8.13.20; 31,16.20.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ For a summary of scholarly opinion on the age of the patriarchal covenant and promise traditions see C. WESTERMANN, “Promises to the Patriarchs”, *IDBSup*, 690-693, with bibliography; See further, H. SCHMID, *Der sogennante Jahwist* (Zürich 1976) 119-153; R. RENDTORFF, *Das Überlieferungsgeschichtliche Problem des Pentateuch* (BZAW 147; Berlin - New York 1976) 37-65.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Rather than the “Sinai” of Neh 9,13. On the significance of the difference see now GINSBERG, *Israelian Heritage*, 18.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ The verse is generally considered a redactional addition. See the literature cited in W. SCHOTTRUFF, *‘Gedenken’ im alten Orient und im Alten Testament* (Neukirchen-Vluyn 1964) 157.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ So, NOTH, *Laws*, 95.

over covenant⁽⁵¹⁾ but the triumph of monotheism over polytheism and monolatry⁽⁵²⁾. To enter a covenant to serve only Yahweh made little sense in the post-exilic period, when for monotheistic Judaism, there were no competing gods to serve. Indeed, Sara Japhet's summation of the central theological teaching of Chronicles applies to the entire post-exilic notion of "covenant", and points to a proper understanding of the Chronicler's references to ברית between Israel and Yahweh⁽⁵³⁾:

In the history of the people, the author stresses several points, above all the tie between the people and their God. This tie exists not in consequence of any deed but in and of itself, as a reality existing from the beginning without need for reasons or explanations. The tie is mutual: the people serve their God and God watches over and provides for his people⁽⁵⁴⁾.

Accordingly, the confessions of Israel's past sins in Chronicles agree with their counterparts in Ezra-Nehemiah⁽⁵⁵⁾ in omitting covenant-violation. At the same time, the Chronicler differs on the point with the deuteronomistic history. Thus, where 2 Kgs 17,15 includes the rejection of "his covenant" (בריתו) among the sins which resulted in the fall of the Northern Kingdom, 1 Chr 5,25 refers to "trespass" (וימקלו) and "whoring after" (ויזנו) the local gods, but not to covenant violation. In contrast, when the Chronicler refers to covenant in the hymn of praise in 1 Chr 17,8-36, he employs the term exactly as in Ezra-Nehemiah:

⁽⁵¹⁾ Cf. J. LEVENSON, "The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament and Historical Criticism", *The Future of Biblical Studies* (R. FRIEDMAN and G. WILLIAMSON, eds.) (Atlanta 1987) 18-59.

⁽⁵²⁾ Monolatry is inherently polytheistic in that it does not deny the divinity of gods to whom it denies worship. See SPERLING, "Israel's Religion", 27; See further, M. TSEVAT, *The Meaning of the Book of Job and Other Biblical Studies* (New York 1980) 131-147.

⁽⁵³⁾ Our discussion does not deal with the Chronicler's references to covenants among humans (e.g. 1 Chr 11,3; 2 Chr 16,3; 23,1.3), the role of ark of the covenant (e.g. 1 Chr 16,37) and the covenant between Yahweh and the Davidids (2 Chr 13,5; 21,7).

⁽⁵⁴⁾ S. JAPHET, "Chronicles, Book of", *EncJud* 5, 530.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ The relation of the authorship of Chronicles to that of Ezra-Nehemiah does not materially affect our discussion.

Be mindful of his covenant (בריתו)
 The word he ordained (צוה) for a thousand generations⁽⁵⁶⁾
 Which he accorded (כרת את) Abraham
 —His oath to Isaac—
 Which he confirmed (ויעמידה) to Jacob by decree (חק)
 To Israel⁽⁵⁷⁾ by eternal covenant (ברית עולם)
 Saying, 'To You I shall give the land of Canaan
 As your allotted heritage' (vv. 15-17).

As in the Ezra-Nehemiah passages, the covenant in 1 Chronicles 17 is the unconditional land-grant to the remote ancestors.

The Chronicler's attitude to divine ברית becomes especially clear when one examines the way in which Chronicles rewords or refashions earlier sources. Thus, for example, in Solomon's dedicatory prayer (2 Chr 6,11) the reference to "the ark containing the covenant of Yahweh (ברית יהוה) which he made with Israel" omits the phrase "when he took them out of Egypt" found in the Chronicler's source (1 Kgs 8,21). Even more striking is Yahweh's response to Solomon's prayer in 2 Chr 7,21b-22:

Everyone passing by it shall be appalled and say, 'Why did Yahweh do thus to this land and to this house?' And they shall reply, 'It is because they forsook Yahweh, (עזבו את יהוה) God of their ancestors, who took them out of Egypt, adopting other gods, worshipping and serving them. Therefore, he brought all this calamity on them.'

The above passage is based on Deut 29,23-25. In Deuteronomy, however, the answer to the question, "Why did Yahweh do thus to this land?" is: "Because they *forsook* (עזבו) *the covenant* of Yahweh (ברית יהוה), the God of their ancestors, which he made with them when he took them out of Egypt, going and serving other gods and worshipping them"⁽⁵⁸⁾.

⁽⁵⁶⁾ I.e. "forever".

⁽⁵⁷⁾ I.e., the patriarch of that name.

⁽⁵⁸⁾ Cf. further Jer 22,8-9 where the gentiles ask why the great city was destroyed. As in Deuteronomy, the answer is: "They forsook the covenant (עזבו את ברית יהוה) of Yahweh their God". The covenant backgrounds of Deut 29,23-25 and Jer 22,8-9 are assured by the close parallel in the annals of Assurbanipal where the Arabs ponder the reason for their land's destruction. To their own question they reply: *aššu adê rabûti ša Aššur lā niššuru niḫtû ana ṭabtî Aššur-ban-aplu šarri narām libbi Enlil* "Because we did not adhere

2 Chr 15,12, set in the reign of Asa, speaks of the people entering a covenant (ויבאו בברית) to: לדרוש את יהוה אלהי אבותיהם. In 15,13 execution is threatened for anyone who fails to. In 15,15 the people's whole-hearted action is rewarded by Yahweh who responds immediately (וימצא) and brings them respite (וינח). The entire story⁽⁵⁹⁾ becomes clear once the meaning of דרש⁽⁶⁰⁾ within the Asa narrative is explained. In this pericope, דרש attests the sense of "turn to for help", "depend on"⁽⁶¹⁾. Thus, דרש in 14,6 is synonymous with נשען על "lean on" and בא בשם "come in the name of" in 14,10. Similarly, within the same narrative, the Chronicler provides two anecdotal illustrations of Asa's flawed faith in Yahweh. First (15,7), we learn that Asa preferred dependence on (נשען על) the king of Aram to dependence on (נשען על) Yahweh. In the second anecdote (16,12) we learn that when Asa developed a leg malady he "turned not to Yahweh" (לא דרש) but to the physicians. In like manner the verb דרש in 15,2 is opposed to עזב "forsake", and replaced by בקש "seek" in 15,4. Similarly, בקש in 15,15 replaces דרש in 15,12-13. Recent scholarship to the contrary notwithstanding, the ברית in this chapter is not a formal "covenant renewal"⁽⁶²⁾ but a sworn agreement to a specific course of action; namely, to rely on Yahweh in time of cri-

to the great covenant of (the god) Asshur; we violated the kind agreement of Assurbanipal beloved of Enlil", M. STRECK, *Assurbanipal und die letzten assyrischen Könige bis zum Untergange Niniveh's*, II (Leipzig 1916) 78 (col. IX, 68-74). See R. FRANKENA, "The Vassal Treaties of Esarhaddon and the Dating of Deuteronomy", *OTS* 14 (1965) 153-154. Note that the parallel terms *adû* and *ṭābtu* correspond very closely with Heb ברית and חסד. See WEINFELD, *Leš* 36, 92.

⁽⁵⁹⁾ The pericope has been aptly characterized as "aggadic exegesis", of passages from the Pentateuch and old prophecies. See FISHBANE, *Biblical Interpretation*, 388-392.

⁽⁶⁰⁾ On דרש in Chronicles see E. RUPRECHT, *TWAT* I, 466; Cf. S. WAGNER, *TDOT* 3, 301.

⁽⁶¹⁾ Possibly, the semantic range of the verb was expanded in post-exilic Hebrew under the influence of such Akkadian verbs as *saḥāru* and *še'û*, both of which mean "seek", "search", "look for", but which are attested in the additional senses "turn to", "depend on". On these verbs and their links to דרש and its Hebrew synonyms see M. HELD, "Two Philological Notes on Enūma Eliš", *Kramer Anniversary Volume* (B. EICHLER ed.) (Kevalaer 1976) 233, nn. 23-24.

⁽⁶²⁾ Contra e.g., MCCARTHY, "Covenant and Law", 29 (= *Institution*, 96); Cf. KUTSCH, *Verheissung*, 163.

sis⁽⁶³⁾, Only in 2 Chr 34,31 is there a reference to a real ברית between Israel and Yahweh that Israel follow Yahweh. But this verse, set in Josiah's reign, is merely copied from 2 Kgs 23,3. Significantly, the phrase העם בברית "All the people entered the covenant" (2 Kgs 23,3) is missing from the Chronicler's account.

In the manner of Ezra-Nehemiah and Chronicles, other post-exilic writings consistently avoid suggesting that Israel violated ברית, and avoid collocating ברית and law. Psalm 106, clearly an exilic composition⁽⁶⁴⁾, provides a detailed account of Israel's sinfulness and Yahweh's contrasting loyalty (חסד) and mighty deeds (גבורות). The writer dwells at some length (vv. 14-33) on the negative wilderness traditions related in detail in the Pentateuch, especially in Numbers. The sordid narrative continues (vv. 34-39) with Israel's failure to eliminate the sinful inhabitants of the promised land and the consequent adoption by Israel of their ways, including the sacrifice of children (v. 37) to demons (שדים) and the worship of idols. Naturally, Yahweh punished the Israelites by giving them over to conquerors and oppressors (vv. 41-44). But after they relented and prayed, Yahweh too relented, remembered his ברית (v. 45), and caused their captors to be merciful towards them. As in Nehemiah, for all its sins, Israel of Psalm 106 has failed to break a ברית⁽⁶⁵⁾.

The "liturgical gem"⁽⁶⁶⁾ that is the prayer of Dan 9,4-19, shows the same attitude to ברית as the previous selections. Yahweh is (v. 4): שמר הברית והחסד. The errant Israelites "did not heed the prophets" (v. 6). Consequently, the Lord (Adonai) has "justice" (צדקה) on his side while Israel (vv. 7-8) has "shamefacedness" (בשת הפנים). Israel (v. 10) did not obey Yahweh nor follow "his teachings" (תורתיו),

⁽⁶³⁾ Cf. Peshitta: מריא קדם וימיו מומתא דנצלון "They swore oaths that they would pray to the Lord".

⁽⁶⁴⁾ See vv. 27.47.

⁽⁶⁵⁾ Contrast N. RICHARDSON, "Psalm 106: Yahweh's Succoring Love Saves from the Death of a Broken Covenant", *Love and Death in the Ancient Near East. Essays in Honor of Marvin H. Pope* (J. MARKS and R. GOOD eds.) (Guilford 1987) 191-203. As the title indicates, Richardson reads the Psalm as a tale of Israel's breach of covenant. See especially, *ibid.*, 201-203.

⁽⁶⁶⁾ So, J. MONTGOMERY, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh 1927) 361. For a detailed study of the chapter see A. LACOCQUE, "The Liturgical Prayer in Daniel 9", *HUCA* 47 (1976) 119-142.

which he "set before us (נתן לפנינו) through his servants the prophets".

The studied avoidance of Israel's covenant violation is especially striking in v. 11: "All Israel has transgressed your law (עברו את תורתך) and gone astray, disobeying you; so the curse of the oath (hendiadys: האלה והשבעה)⁽⁶⁷⁾ which is written in the Torah of Moses, has poured down (והתך) upon us". But if Israel has "transgressed law", they have not broken a covenant, in contrast to what is envisioned in Deut 29, a chapter surely known to the writer of Daniel 9. It is hardly a coincidence that Israel of Daniel's day is bearing the consequences of "the curse of the oath"⁽⁶⁸⁾, rather than the "covenant curses" (אלות הברית) of Deut 29,20.

The post-exilic prophets follow a similar pattern. Haggai does not employ the term ברית⁽⁶⁹⁾, although there is a broken reference (2,5) to: הדבר אשר כרתי אתכם בצאתכם ממצרים: "The matter which I covenanted with you when you left Egypt"⁽⁷⁰⁾.

The book of Zechariah likewise avoids reference to a conditional national ברית even when it might have been expected. The prophet instead attributes Israel's misfortunes to failure to heed the earlier prophets. Thus, he reminds his listeners (1,6): "My prophecies and decrees (דברי וחקי) with which I commissioned (צויתי) my servants the prophets surely overtook (השיגו) your ancestors, so that they were brought to conclude: 'Yahweh Seba'ot has dealt with us according to our customary manner (כדרכינו וכמעללינו), just as he purposed'". Because Zechariah's proof is from earlier prophecy, vv. 4 and 6 employ language verbally close to Jeremiah's calls to his contemporaries to improve their "customary manner"⁽⁷¹⁾. But although the verb (השיגו) recalls the language of Deuteronomy 28, where the curses accompa-

⁽⁶⁷⁾ Cf. H. BRICHTO, *The Problem of 'Curse' in the Hebrew Bible* (SBLMS 13; Philadelphia 1963).

⁽⁶⁸⁾ Cf. Num 5,21; Neh 10,30.

⁽⁶⁹⁾ The phrase זאת הברית "this is the covenant" is arbitrarily restored to Hag 2,5 by K. ELLIGER, *Das Buch der zwölf kleinen Propheten*, II (ATD; Göttingen 1959) 91.

⁽⁷⁰⁾ The phrase has no counterpart in LXX, which reflects no break between צבאות of Heb v. 4 and ורוחי of Heb v. 5b. For recent studies of the verse see D. PETERSEN, *Haggai and Zechariah 1-8* (Philadelphia 1984) 61; C. MEYERS and E. MEYERS, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8* (AB; Garden City 1987) 51-52.

⁽⁷¹⁾ See especially Jer 35,15; see further Jer 7,3,5; 18,11; 26,13.

nying the covenant⁽⁷²⁾ overtake the violators⁽⁷³⁾, in Zechariah, חֲקִי רִבְרִי are responsible. The same theme recurs in 7,12: "They made their hearts adamant against hearing the instruction and the prophecies (אֶת הַתּוֹרָה וְאֶת הַנְּבוּאִים)⁽⁷⁴⁾ which Yahweh Seba'ot had sent them by his spirit through the earlier prophets; so a great wrath issued from Yahweh Seba'ot".

In the latter part⁽⁷⁵⁾ of the book of Zechariah (9,11) there is an obscure reference to "blood of your covenant" (דָּם בְּרִיתְךָ) which might refer to the covenant in Exod 24,8, but given the setting of the hellenistic period (v. 13)⁽⁷⁶⁾ when circumcision might call for martyrdom, could as easily refer to the blood of circumcision⁽⁷⁷⁾. Finally, the extremely difficult Zech 11,10 reads: "Taking my staff Favor (נֶעֱמָ) I cleft it in two, so as to annul the covenant I had made (בְּרִיתִי אֲשֶׁר כָּרַחְתִּי) with all the peoples". The specific content of the ברית in Zech 11,10 must be discerned both from what precedes and from what follows. In v. 6 the prophet says:

For I will show mercy no more (לֹא אֲחַמֵּל) to the inhabitants of the land - Yahweh's word - but I will place every human being (הָאָדָם) in the hand of every other and in the royal hand. They shall break the land to bits (וַיִּכְתְּמוּ) and I will not rescue it from their hands.

According to v. 6, without Yahweh's mercy all humans would attack each other. The same thought recurs in the metaphor of the sheep in v. 9:

⁽⁷²⁾ See Deut 28,15.45.69.

⁽⁷³⁾ See MEYERS and MEYERS, *Haggai, Zechariah 1-8*, 96.

⁽⁷⁴⁾ The exact phrase occurs nowhere else.

⁽⁷⁵⁾ "The latter part of the book of Zechariah presents vast and, in part, insoluble problems in respect of authorship, date and interpretation". See W. NEIL, "Zechariah, Book of", *IDB* 4, 945.

⁽⁷⁶⁾ Ibn Ezra and Rashi a.l. already referred this prophecy to the Hasmonean period.

⁽⁷⁷⁾ See 1 Macc 1,15.48.60-61.63; 2,46. The medieval Jewish scholars were unsure which covenantal blood was involved. Rashi preferred a connection with Exod 24,8, Qimhi, the blood of circumcision. Ibn Ezra suggests both possibilities. For modern opinions see KUTSCH, *Verheissung*, 83-85.

So I declared; "I am not going to tend you; let the one that is to die, die and the one that is to get lost, get lost; and let the rest devour each other's flesh".

The instrument of Yahweh's mercy, which under normal circumstances keeps the people from devouring each other and the land intact, is the covenant mediated by Yahweh among all the peoples. Yahweh's power enables him to maintain all of creation harmoniously or to let chaos reign⁽⁷⁸⁾. Further elucidation of Zech 11,10 is provided by the parallel action of the prophet described in v. 14: "Then I cleft in two my second staff, Union, so as to annul the brotherhood (אֶחָוָה) between Judah and Israel". There is no mention of בְּרִית between Judah and Israel because their relation is familial, whereas the language of a בְּרִית serves fictitiously to create a familial relation⁽⁷⁹⁾. Accordingly, the mention of בְּרִית in v. 10 is homologous to the mention of אֶחָוָה in v. 14, recalling such Akkadian combinations as *aḥḫūtu/tabūtu* "brotherhood/friendship" and *aḥḫūtu/salāmu/sulummū/ra'amūtu* "brotherhood/alliance/peace/love"⁽⁸⁰⁾. Just as the cleaving of the second staff annuls the fraternal relation (v. 14), the cleaving of the first annuls the artificial relation established by covenant. The covenant whose threatened annulment (לְהַפִּיר) in v. 10 materializes in v. 11 (וּתְפֹר) is not related to the specific national covenant between Yahweh and Israel. The בְּרִית of this chapter is akin instead to the בְּרִית in such passages as Hos 2,20, Ezek 34,25 and Job 5,23⁽⁸¹⁾ where it is an instrument of security.

⁽⁷⁸⁾ Cf. F. ANDERSEN-D. N. FREEDMAN, *Hosea* (AB; Garden City 1980) 280-282.

⁽⁷⁹⁾ See Amos 1,9. NJV translates "covenant of brotherhood" and calls attention to the use of "my brother" in 1 Kgs 9,13 in light of the covenant of 1 Kgs 5,26. For extra-biblical parallels to the use of familial vocabulary in ancient Near Eastern diplomacy and politics, see WEINFELD, "The Covenant of Grant", 194; H. TADMOR, "Treaty and Oath in the Ancient Near East: A Historian's Approach", *Humanizing America's Iconic Book* (G. TUCKER-D. KNIGHT, eds.) (Chico 1982) 131, 141.

⁽⁸⁰⁾ For examples and references see TADMOR, "Treaty", 131.

⁽⁸¹⁾ Cf. בְּרִית/הַשְׁלָמָה לִךְ in Ezek 34,25 with the parallelism בְּרִית שְׁלוֹם in Job 5,23. See KUTSCH, *Verheissung*, 132 with the literature cited *ibid.*, n. 177. Note, however, how Kutsch forces the sense of "Verpflichtung" into Zech 11,10 and these other passages.

There is likewise no reference to a conditional covenant with the nation of Israel in the exilic and post-exilic sections of Isaiah⁽⁸²⁾. The most famous ברית passage in Isa 40–66 is also the most difficult⁽⁸³⁾. Isa 42,6⁽⁸⁴⁾ reads: “I Yahweh have triumphantly (בצדק)⁽⁸⁵⁾ summoned you and guided you (אחזק בידך)⁽⁸⁶⁾. When I created you⁽⁸⁷⁾ I made you a luminary to a people, (ברית עם) a light to the nations”. As noted by Rashi, the prophet is the one to whom these words are addressed. The prophet is to be a ברית to a people (singular) as well as a light to the nations (plural)⁽⁸⁸⁾. Obviously, the more common English rendering⁽⁸⁹⁾ “covenant(ed) people” would have to be expressed by ברית עם*⁽⁹⁰⁾. Parallelism and context demand a term synonymous or compatible with אור. Ehrlich’s suggestion⁽⁹¹⁾

⁽⁸²⁾ The question of the existence of a Trito-Isaiah alongside of Deutero-Isaiah does not affect the present inquiry. For bibliography on the question see N. SNAITH, *Isaiah 40–66. A Study of the Teaching of The Second Isaiah and Its Consequences* (VTS 14; Leiden 1977) 219–221.

⁽⁸³⁾ See the commentaries cited in KUTSCH, *Verheissung*, 133–134. For the passage in the context of Deutero-Isaiah’s theology see H. ORLINSKY, “‘A Covenant [of] People, A Light of the Nations’ — a Problem in Biblical Theology”, *Essays in Biblical Culture and Bible Translation* (H. ORLINSKY, ed.) (New York 1974) 166–186; id., *Studies on the Second Part of the Book of Isaiah*. The So-Called ‘Servant of the Lord’ and ‘Suffering Servant’ in Deutero-Isaiah (VTS 14; Leiden 1977 [revision of 1967 version]) 97–117.

⁽⁸⁴⁾ MT of Isa 49,6 has only the second phrase: לאור גוים. One LXX recension reads both phrases in Isa 49,6 as well.

⁽⁸⁵⁾ See EHRlich, *Mikrâ* III, 91; Cf. ORLINSKY, “Servant”, 107: “I the Lord have summoned you in triumph”. Cf. Isa 45,13 where any other translation than “triumphantly” is forced. Note further that Ps 17,15 should be translated: “I shall triumphantly see your face”.

⁽⁸⁶⁾ For extra-biblical parallels to this phrase see S. PAUL, “Deutero-Isaiah and Cuneiform Royal Inscriptions”, *JAOS* 88 (1968) 182, n. 19.

⁽⁸⁷⁾ The root is יצר, “create”, “form”. See S. PAUL, “Literary and Ideological Echoes of Jeremiah in Deutero-Isaiah”, *Proceedings of the Fifth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (P. PELI, ed.) (Jerusalem 1969) 109, n. 29.

⁽⁸⁸⁾ For the parallelism: עם/גוים cf. Num 23,9; Rashi’s observation that גוים is frequently applied to Israel has been underscored by ORLINSKY, “Servant”, 112.

⁽⁸⁹⁾ For a sampling of translations see ORLINSKY, “Covenant”, 180.

⁽⁹⁰⁾ Cf. the expressions את ברית “covenant sign” (Gen 9,13); נקם ברית “covenant violation” (Lev 26,25) and נגיד ברית “covenant prince” (Dan 11,22). Peshitta a.l. translates: קימא לעמא “covenant to a people”.

⁽⁹¹⁾ EHRlich, *Mikrâ* III, 92; Cf. NEB: “To be a light to all peoples, a beacon for the nations”.

that some vocable from the root *brr*, "shine", "be bright", is attested here is extremely plausible.

The other examples of ברית in the exilic sections of Isaiah refer to the unconditional covenant between Yahweh and Israel:

For this to me is like the waters (var.: days⁽⁹²⁾) of Noah
 As I swore that the waters of Noah would never again
 flood the earth
 So I swear that I will not be angry with you nor rebuke you
 For the mountains may move
 And the hills be shaken
 But my loyalty (חסדי) shall not move from you.
 Nor my covenant of friendship (ברית שלומי) be shaken
 Says Yahweh, who takes you back in love (Isa 54,9-10).

The sense of this passage is that in contrast to Yahweh's anger, which was temporary (Isa 54,6-8), his covenant will now be permanent⁽⁹³⁾. As surely as the flood was a singular event that will never again disrupt creation, so too will Yahweh never again rebuke his people in anger. Both the order of creation (Gen 9,11-16) and Yahweh's relation to Israel are guaranteed by unconditional ברית.

The author of Isa 55,3 explicitly derives the new unconditional permanent covenant between Yahweh and Israel from the Davidic royal ideology:

Incline your ear and come to me
 Listen and you shall be revived
 And I will make with you an everlasting covenant (ברית עולם)
 The inviolable commitments⁽⁹⁴⁾ (חסדי דוד) to David⁽⁹⁵⁾.

⁽⁹²⁾ See Peshitta a.l.

⁽⁹³⁾ Cf. C. WESTERMANN, *Isaiah 40-66. A Commentary* (Philadelphia 1969) 276.

⁽⁹⁴⁾ One might even translate: "covenants". Cf. N. GLUECK, *Hesed in the Bible* (translation of the 1927 German edition, by A. Gottschalk; Cincinnati 1967) 77-78.

⁽⁹⁵⁾ The syntax of the passage, is captured by K. SAKENFELD, *The Meaning of Hesed in the Hebrew Bible: A New Inquiry* (Missoula 1978) 201-202: "I will establish for you an everlasting covenant
 The trustworthy *heseds* which were for David".

The Davidids had viewed Yahweh's covenant with them as unconditional⁽⁹⁶⁾. The "very ancient"⁽⁹⁷⁾ text 2 Sam 23,5 refers to Yahweh's ברית עולם⁽⁹⁸⁾ with David. Weinfeld has shown that it was the deuteronomic redactor of Kings who first put the promise to David under condition (1 Kgs 2,4; 8,25; 9,4)⁽⁹⁹⁾. The fall of the kingdom of Judah and the subsequent exile facilitated the extension of the permanent unconditional covenant to the entire people. "With his chosen people God intends to make a lasting (or permanent) covenant, the content of which is defined in the words that follow, the steadfast, sure tokens of grace vouchsafed to David"⁽¹⁰⁰⁾. It is this unconditional covenant with the entire people, not the older conditional ברית, that is found in the exilic portions of Isaiah.

The other interesting use of ברית in exilic Isaiah is found in 56,1-7:

(96) McCarthy's statement that "the promise turns out not to be quite so unconditional as usually claimed" is unsubstantiated. See D. MCCARTHY, "Compact and Kingship: Stimuli for Hebrew Covenant Thinking", *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon and Other Essays* (T. ISHIDA, ed.) (Winona Lake 1982) 87; Cf. the ideology expressed in Ps 89,4-5. Although the final form of the Psalm is late, the promise belongs to its older stratum. See N. SARNA, "Psalm 89, A Study in Inner Biblical Exegesis", *Biblical and Other Studies* (A. ALTMANN, ed.) (Cambridge, MA 1963) 29-46. On Ps 132,12, which presents a contrary ideology, that the permanence of the dynasty is conditional, see M. TSEVAT, "The Steadfast House", in id., *Meaning of Job*, 109; Cf. WEINFELD, "The Covenant of Grant", 196.

(97) So G. VON RAD, "The Royal Ritual in Judah", in id., *The Problem of the Hexateuch and Other Essays* (London 1966) 227. For bibliography on the dating of the passage see SARNA, "Psalm 89", 39-40.

(98) According to PERLITT, *Bundestheologie*, 50, ברית עולם is an indication of lateness because the expression "ist nicht vor der Mitte des 6. Jh.s, dann aber breit und typisch belegt". Presumably, "breit und typisch" permits Perlitt to dismiss the significance of Isa 24,5, which is surely an authentic Isaianic verse.

(99) WEINFELD, "The Covenant of Grant", 195. The divine grant of a throne conditionally or unconditionally is, in itself, not a sufficient criterion for fixing the date of a text. A Mari letter provides an early example of the god's conditional gift of the throne. See G. DOSSIN and A. LODS, "Une Tablette inédite de Mari, intéressante pour l'histoire ancienne du prophétisme sémitique", *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Professor T. H. Robinson* (H. ROWLEY, ed.) (Edinburgh 1950) 103 ll. 9-23; Cf. W. VON SODEN, *Bibel und alter Orient* (Berlin 1985) 29.

(100) WESTERMANN, *Isaiah 40-66*, 283-284, with references to earlier literature.

1. Thus said Yahweh: "Keep (שמר) justice
And do (עשו) righteousness⁽¹⁰¹⁾.
For soon my salvation shall come,
And my victory be revealed.
2. Happy the person who does (יעשה) this
And the mortal who holds to it (יחזיק בה)
Who keeps (שמר) the Sabbath
Rather than profane it
And keeps (שמר) his hand from doing (מעשה) any evil.
3. For let not the foreigner who has cleaved to Yahweh say:
'Yahweh will always keep me separate from his people'
And let not the eunuch say: 'I am a withered tree'.
4. For thus said Yahweh: 'As regards the eunuchs
Who keep (ישמרו) my Sabbaths
And who have chosen that in which I delight
And who keep my covenant (ומחזיקים בבריתי)
5. I will give them, in my house, within my walls
A named monument—⁽¹⁰²⁾
A thing better than sons and daughters.
I shall give them an everlasting name,
Which shall not perish.
6. As for the foreigners who cleave to Yahweh
To wait on him
To love the name of Yahweh
To be his slaves (עבדים)
All those who observe the Sabbath
Rather than profane it
And who keep to my covenant (ומחזיקים בבריתי)
7. I will bring them to my sacred mountain
And let them celebrate⁽¹⁰³⁾ in my house of prayer
Their holocausts and sacrifices
Shall be acceptable (לרצון)⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ on my altar".

⁽¹⁰¹⁾ For a thorough study of "justice and righteousness" see M. WEINFELD, *Justice and Righteousness in the Nations: Equality and Freedom in Ancient Israel in Light of Social Justice in the Ancient Near East* (Hebrew; Jerusalem 1985).

⁽¹⁰²⁾ Cf. 2 Sam 18,18 where the יד memorial is erected in the absence of progeny. See WESTERMANN, *Isaiah 40–66*, 314.

⁽¹⁰³⁾ I.e. festivals and rituals. For the technical sense of שמח see Deut 12,18; 16,11.14; 14,26; 26,11; 27,7; Ps 118,24; Ezra 6,22; Neh 12,43.

⁽¹⁰⁴⁾ For the technical sense of רצח see e.g. Lev 1,4; 7,18; 22,20.21.27; Jer 6,20; Amos 5,22; Mal 1,10.13; Ps 19,15; 51,18; 119,108.

As already suggested in Qimhi's commentary to 56,4, בריתי means the "covenant of circumcision". The background of Isaiah 56 is the controversy during the Persian period between the parties aptly designated by Smith as the "assimilationists" and the "segregationists"⁽¹⁰⁵⁾. The segregationists refused both to obligate outsiders by the laws of the post-exilic Jewish community and to grant them its benefits of membership. In contrast, the assimilationists were in favor of intermarriage and the incorporation of outsiders. Isa 56,1-7 is a compromise between the competing positions. Gentiles who cleaved to Yahweh could be incorporated into the cult-community. The author of these lines, unlike the author of Ezra-Nehemiah, does not consider genealogy an insuperable barrier to membership in Yahweh's people (עמו). Genealogical insufficiency may be overcome by righteous conduct (vv. 1-2), and adherence to two specific ritual requirements: observance of the Sabbath, an ancient institution whose importance had increased during the exile⁽¹⁰⁶⁾, and circumcision⁽¹⁰⁷⁾. It will be observed that here, as elsewhere, exilic Isaiah reflects traditions preserved in the book of Genesis⁽¹⁰⁸⁾. Specifically, the verbal parallels between Genesis 17 and Isaiah 56 show that Isa 56,1-7 is a midrashic legal application of Genesis 17⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ to the situation of the Persian period. According to Genesis 17 (10-14.23-27), Yahweh made his covenant (בריתי) with Abra(ha)m, requiring the patriarch to maintain (שמר) the practice (v. 13) of circumcising all his male descendants in perpetuity (ברית עולם). The requirement of cir-

⁽¹⁰⁵⁾ M. SMITH, "Jewish Religious Life in the Persian Period", *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, I (W. DAVIES-L. FINKELSTEIN, eds.) (Cambridge 1984) 219-278, especially 244-251; cf. id., *Palestinian Parties and Politics that Shaped the Old Testament* (New York 1971) 180-182.

⁽¹⁰⁶⁾ See the summary in R. DE VAUX, *Ancient Israel*, I (New York 1965) 475-483.

⁽¹⁰⁷⁾ Contrast SNAITH, *Isaiah 40-66*, 226.

⁽¹⁰⁸⁾ We have discussed the reference to Noah (Isa 54,9) above. Note further that Gen 17,14-15 makes reference to Sarah, who outside of Genesis is not mentioned anywhere in the OT other than Isa 51,2. It has also been demonstrated that exilic Isaiah was both aware of and opposed to the cosmology of Genesis 1. See M. WEINFELD, "The Creator God in Genesis 1 and in the Prophecy of Second Isaiah", (Hebrew) *Tarbiz* 37 (1965) 105-132.

⁽¹⁰⁹⁾ For previous studies see E. KUTSCH, "'Ich will euer Gott sein'", *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (A. SHINAN, ed.) (Jerusalem 1977) 245-254, with reference to earlier literature.

cumcision as enunciated in Genesis 17 applies even to the slave⁽¹¹⁰⁾ members of the household acquired from "every foreigner" (v. 12: מכל בן נכר; v. 27: מאת בן נכר). According to Gen 17,14, failure to circumcise results in excision of the individual from the people because he has broken the covenant (ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מעמיה את בריתי הפר). From the threat of excision, Isaiah 56 draws the legal inference that circumcision of the slave brings him into the people. He thus derives a mechanism of conversion: The foreigners (v. 3: בן הנכר; v. 6: בני הנכר) who are circumcised are considered keepers of the covenant (מחזיקים בבריתי). They serve Yahweh as slaves (עבדים) and are not to be considered separate from Yahweh's people (עמי). The success of the compromise may be seen in a number of late pentateuchal passages in which the circumcised alien (גר) is permitted to participate in Israelite rituals after undergoing circumcision⁽¹¹¹⁾.

In sum, late biblical texts show that in the exilic and post-exilic periods, unconditional covenant, by which Yahweh and Israel remained in permanent relation had triumphed over the notion of conditional covenant that might be broken.

Hebrew Union College
1 W. 4 Street
New York 10012 U.S.A.

S. David SPERLING

⁽¹¹⁰⁾ Gen 17 does not employ the term עבד. Instead, vv. 12.13.23.27 employ the technical slave categories יליד בית "houseborn", and מקנת כסף "acquired with silver" (cf. Lev 22,11). Note, however, that the pair בית יליד/עבד is attested in poetic parallelism in Jer 2,14. (See M. HELD, "Rhetorical Questions in Ugaritic and Biblical Hebrew", *Erlsr* 9 [1969] 76. See *ibid.*, for בית יליד = Akk *wilid bitim*. The precise sense of *wilid bitim* is uncertain. See F. KRAUS, *Königliche Verfügungen in altbabylonischer Zeit* [Leiden 1984] 280-284.) Another slave designation employed by the author of Gen 17 (vv. 23.27) is the summary term: אנשי בית. Cf. Aramaic נשי בית "household slaves" and Akk *niši bīti*. See H. L. GINSBERG, *ANET*, 633, n. 4; S. KAUFMAN, *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic* (AS 19; Chicago 1974) 78. The term *niši bīti* "serfs, retainers belonging to an estate, a household, a palace or a person" is attested for all periods of Akkadian. See references in *CAD* N/II, 287-288.

⁽¹¹¹⁾ See especially Exod 12,43-50; cf. SMITH, *Parties*, 180-182. SMITH, *ibid.* (cf. *id.*, "Religious Life", 271), has correctly recognized Isaiah 56 as a religious compromise. That Isaiah 56 requires circumcision as well as Sabbath observance buttresses Smith's argument.

SOMMAIRE

Certains spécialistes considèrent l'«alliance» (*b'rit*) comme une institution centrale de l'ancien Israël; d'autres y voient au contraire le produit d'une réflexion théologique tardive. Entre ces deux extrêmes, on trouve un certain nombre de positions intermédiaires.

Ce débat est en grande partie lié à un autre problème: comment s'assurer que les traditions spécifiques de l'alliance dans des contextes anciens reflètent bien des traditions anciennes? Nous avons plutôt concentré notre effort sur l'«alliance» dans des textes post-exiliques dont la date ne fait aucun doute. Nous concluons que ces écrits tardifs et monothéistes ignorent les images les plus anciennes et une alliance conditionnelle lorsqu'ils décrivent la relation qui unit Yahweh et Israël. Ces mêmes écrits soulignent le fait que l'alliance de Yahweh est inconditionnelle et infrangible.

Christology and the Eucharist in the Epistle to the Hebrews

The subject of the eucharist in the Epistle to the Hebrews is one of the minor points of disagreement in contemporary New Testament studies. It is minor because relatively few people are in favor of seeing any allusions at all to the eucharist in the letter, and even these few regard the allusions as quite secondary to the main purpose of the document⁽¹⁾.

The present writer has in the past sustained the view that there are allusions to the eucharist in the epistle⁽²⁾. The time has now come to repeat this claim and put it on a sounder footing. The sounder footing is the work being done by Francis Martin on the Christology of the epistle, in particular with regard to the word *τελειόω* and related concepts⁽³⁾. There will be no "proofs" offered — the material does not seem to lend itself to a presentation which issues in certitude. All that will be claimed is that the hypothesis of the importance of the eucharist gives a coherence, relevance, and depth to the letter which is otherwise lacking.

(1) Convenient summaries are found in P. ANDRIESEN, "L'Eucharistie dans l'Épître aux Hébreux", *NRT* 94 (1972) 269-277 (*pro*), and R. WILLIAMSON, "The Eucharist and the Epistle to the Hebrews", *NTS* 21 (1975) 300-312 (*contra*).

(2) "The Greater and More Perfect Tent. A Contribution to the Discussion of Hebrews 9,11", *Bib* 47 (1966) 91-106; "On the Imagery and Significance of Hebrews 9,9-10", *CBQ* 28 (1966) 155-173; "Hebrews 9,2 and the Uses of Consistency", *CBQ* 32 (1970) 205-221.

(3) The present article was inspired by a suggestion made by Martin in regard to the "completion" of Jesus' body at the resurrection. The suggestion was made in the course of a meeting of the Task Force "Aspects of Christology in the Letter to the Hebrews" held during the Forty-Seventh General Meeting of the Catholic Biblical Association of America in New Orleans, August 11-13, 1984. The author of the present article assumes responsibility for the development of this suggestion as it is contained in the pages which follow.

I. Jesus as "Completed"

1. Occurrences of τελειόω in Hebrews

The word τελειόω appears nine times in the epistle: 2,10; 5,9; 7,19; 7,28; 9,9; 10,1; 10,14; 11,40; and 12,23. At 2,10 it is related intrinsically to the "glory" to which the risen Jesus will lead many sons in his role as the "originator" of salvation⁽⁴⁾. At 5,9 it is used to qualify Jesus again in his attained capacity to be a cause of salvation for all who obey him. At 7,19 it is used in its negated form to indicate the inadequacy of the Mosaic Law with regard to making possible the approach to God. At 7,28 it is used to qualify Jesus as son who has attained the capacity which it signifies in contrast to the Mosaic Law priests who had weakness. At 9,9 the example of the desert tabernacle is a "parable" showing that the gifts and sacrifices of the present time are unable to give the worshipper a certain quality according to his conscience⁽⁵⁾. At 10,1 it is used again in its negated form to indicate the inability of the priests of the Mosaic Law to give by their sacrifices a certain quality to those approaching God. At 10,14 it is used positively to indicate a permanent effect of Jesus on those who are in the process of being sanctified. At 11,40 it is used to describe the quality which the heroes of the old dispensation will receive in some way with the Christians who are recipients of the epistle. Finally, at 12,23 it is used to ascribe a quality to the "souls of the just".

2. The Meaning of τελειόω

The challenge is to find a common denominator for all of the above texts, presuming, of course, that there is a common denominator. In a work as carefully crafted as Hebrews the presumption seems warranted. Literature apart from Hebrews indicates the general meaning "make perfect, complete, accomplish, fulfill" for τελει-

(4) On the translation "originator" for the word ἀρχηγός at Heb 2,10 cf. J. SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac: A Study of the Epistle to the Hebrews in the Light of the Aqedah* (AnBib 94; Rome 1981) 166. Jesus himself first undergoes that to which he calls and as a result is an example causing that which he intends to achieve.

(5) The implication is that the worshipper cannot be freed from his/her consciousness of sin (cf. 9,14; 10,2,22).

όω⁽⁶⁾. Given the eschatological atmosphere of the epistle, this generic meaning seems suitable for all nine occurrences of the word given above⁽⁷⁾. That is to say, definitive, God-willed fulfillment or completion is in question. What this definitive, God-willed fulfillment is in any given text must be sought in the context of that text⁽⁸⁾.

3. τελειόω as Applied to Jesus

The key to understanding the precise nature of the "completion" of Jesus seems to lie in a careful tracing of the role of sacrifice in the epistle. Both 9,9 and 10,1 state explicitly that it was the ineffectual nature of the sacrifices of the old dispensation which precluded the "completion" of the worshippers. This is in contrast to Jesus who, precisely through his sacrifice, has "brought to completion" those who are in the process of being sanctified. This same thought appears at 2,10, but with the idea of sacrifice being expressed by the word "sufferings" (παθήματα), which include death⁽⁹⁾. Again, at 5,9 Jesus is "brought to completion" in connection with the things he has learned as a result of his sufferings (ἐπαθεν). A comparison of 9,9; 10,1; 10,14; 2,10; and 5,9 among themselves shows that the sacrifice of Jesus involved his own death. This view is supported by other texts, such as 7,27 and 9,28.

In the search for a specific meaning of τελειόω, "I bring to completion", with regard to Jesus, the important thing to note about the centrality of his sacrificial death is the fact that it was made possible because he shared in the "blood and flesh" of his "children" (2,14)⁽¹⁰⁾. It was this sharing in blood and flesh which made possible Jesus' death (ἵνα διὰ τοῦ θανάτου...) and hence made pos-

⁽⁶⁾ Cf. D. PETERSON, *Hebrews and Perfection: An Examination of the Concept of Perfection in the 'Epistle to the Hebrews'* (SNTSMS 47; Cambridge 1982) 46.

⁽⁷⁾ Cf. M. SILVA, "Perfection and Eschatology in Hebrews", *WTJ* 39 (1976-1977) 64-65, with note 12.

⁽⁸⁾ Cf. PETERSON, *Hebrews and Perfection*, 48.

⁽⁹⁾ Cf. W. MICHAELIS, "πάθημα", *TWNT* V, 934. The point is not without importance because of the antithetical contrast which results between the means of death — "sufferings" — and "bring to completion".

⁽¹⁰⁾ "The reversal of the words in the standard phrase 'flesh and blood' is probably caused by the author's desire to emphasize the importance of blood in the epistle and to show that Jesus' death (symbolized by blood) was first in order of time over anything else" (SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 171).

sible his sacrifice — thus the central role in Hebrews of the body of Jesus in his sacrifice, a role which is stressed in 10,5 and 10,10 (διὰ τῆς προσφορᾶς τοῦ σώματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. . .)(¹¹). The offering of the body is implied in 10,12 and 10,14.

This emphasis on the body of Jesus is intelligible in part because of the theology of sacrifice which is supposed: without blood there is no remission of sin (9,22)(¹²). But this emphasis seems exaggerated when viewed in the context of the more important factors involved which give Jesus' sacrifice its surpassing worth: his being united with God's will (10,7) and his performing the act of sacrifice "through" the Holy Spirit (9,14)(¹³). The author of Hebrews seems to have some ulterior motive in emphasizing the body of Jesus in his account of Jesus' sacrifice, and the immediate reason for this emphasis would seem to be his view that it was the body of Jesus, composed of blood and flesh, which needed being brought to "completion" if Jesus was to attain the definitive state destined for him by God.

4. τελειόω and the "Completion" of Jesus' Body

This need of the body of Jesus to be brought to completion if he was to attain the definitive state destined for him by God emerges from a study of Chapter 7. There the reason for the appointing of Jesus (ἱερεὺς ἕτερος) as high priest is the fact that he has power of life without end (7,15-17). The weakness of the Levitical priests is their innate lack of continuance because of death (7,23), a lack of continuance built into the Law. Jesus the priest lives forever, and is thus able to save all who come through him to God (7,24-25). Now it was precisely the body which made Jesus liable to death (2,14), so it must be the body which must be changed in some way if death is to be permanently avoided. Hence it is the body which is brought to "completion" if he is to attain the definitive state willed for him by God(¹⁴).

(¹¹) Cf. E. SCHWEIZER, "σῶμα", *TWNT* VII, 1055.

(¹²) Cf. A. VANHOYE, "Sangue e spirito nell'epistola agli Ebrei", *Sangue e antropologia nella letteratura cristiana* (Roma, 29 novembre - 4 dicembre 1982) (ed. F. VATTIONI) (Centro Studi Sanguis Christi 3; Roma 1983) III, 837.

(¹³) *Ibid.*, 834.

(¹⁴) As Martin understands it, the completion of Jesus may be defined as "the rendering of Jesus Christ as totally apt for eternal life". This means, for Martin, "the transformation of his humanity: body, mind, emotions, by

5. *The "Completion" of Jesus' Body and the Resurrection*

The occasion at which the author of Hebrews seems to regard this "completion" of Jesus as taking place is the resurrection, for at 1,9 he applies the words of Ps 45,7 to Jesus: "God anointed you... with the oil of gladness..."⁽¹⁵⁾. It is this metaphorical anointing which is the moment when Jesus fully becomes the Christ, i.e., becomes fully "anointed" (χρίω). Jesus thus conquers death so that, with immortality assured, he will be able to intercede forever with God for those who come to God through him⁽¹⁶⁾. It is the transformation of the body which is crucial: just as Jesus needed a body of blood and flesh to overcome death by means of death (2,14), so he needs a body which has overcome death to be forever available to those who need his intercession (7,24-25)⁽¹⁷⁾.

6. *The Twofold Meaning of υἱός in Hebrews*

The view that it is Jesus' body which was brought to "completion" seems sustained by a close reading of the opening lines of the epistle. At 1,4 Jesus is said to have inherited a name as far above the angels as he himself was. This name is "Son"⁽¹⁸⁾, and 1,5 indicates that it was given him at the resurrection⁽¹⁹⁾. But this is surely a second meaning of "Son", a meaning given to Jesus in addition to

the action of the divinity" (private communication under date of April 22, 1986). The present paper focusses on the "completion" of Jesus' body.

⁽¹⁵⁾ Cf. A. VANHOYE, *Situation du Christ. Hébreux 1-2* (LD 58; Paris 1969) 191-202.

⁽¹⁶⁾ The emphasis placed in various ways by the author of Hebrews on the perpetuity of Christ's intercessory power in contrast to the limited temporal duration of the Levitical intercessory power should not be overlooked. Cf. Heb 6,20; 7,3.8.16.17.23.

⁽¹⁷⁾ At Heb 7,28 the contrast is drawn between the multiple Levitical priests constituted by the Mosaic Law and the unique Son who has been "brought to completion". The specific contrast is between the Levitical priests "having weakness" (ἔχοντας ἀσθένειαν) and the "son forever brought to completion" (υἱὸν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα τετελειωμένον). The use of ἀσθένεια and related words elsewhere in Hebrews shows that limitations other than mortality are in question (cf. 5,2; 11,34), but Heb 4,15 should caution against overplaying the moral aspects as opposed to the physical aspects of this weakness.

⁽¹⁸⁾ Cf. SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 145.

⁽¹⁹⁾ Cf. VANHOYE, *Situation du Christ*, 141-143.

the title "Son" which he enjoyed during his earthly life (cf. 5,8)⁽²⁰⁾. When read with the supposition in mind that at the resurrection Jesus was given a body commensurate with his high priestly need of immortality, the words "You are my Son, today I have given you birth" become stunningly apposite: at the resurrection Jesus finally and fully became the "Son" which his divinely-appointed role in the drama of salvation demanded that he be⁽²¹⁾.

II. Jesus as "Completed" and the Eucharist

1. *The Crux at Hebrews 9,11: The "More Perfect Tent"*

It is against the background of the use of τελειόω in the epistle that the crux at 9,11 should be judged: "Now when Christ appears as high priest of the good things which came about, he entered once for all through the greater and more perfect [τελειότερος] tent not made with human hands, that is, not of this creation, and not through the blood of goats and calves but through his own blood, into the holy place, in securing our eternal redemption". The word "more perfect" (τελειότερος) seems to reflect not only a verdict of superiority as

(20) Cf. SILVA, "Perfection and Eschatology in Hebrews", 62-63. Silva anachronistically uses the terms "human nature" and "divine nature", but it is the reality underlying these technical terms which is important and which Silva correctly identifies. Jesus was able to die by assuming that which was not proper to himself as divine, and it was through a "completion" which eliminated this weakness which he had assumed that he was capable of standing as high priest before God forever.

(21) The twofold meaning of "son" implied in Hebrews opens the way to a possible solution of the classic crux at Rom 8,23, where Christians are portrayed as "groaning in themselves in the expectation of sonship, the redemption of their body". The present writer offered the suggestion some years ago that ἀπεκδέχομαι at Rom 8,23 should be understood as "infer" (cf. "On Romans 8,23 and the 'Expectation of Sonship'", *Bib* 48 [1967] 102-108). But in the light of the two-stage use of "son" in Hebrews it seems more probable that Rom 8,23 simply means that the Christians, although in possession of the first fruits of the Spirit, are groaning in themselves while waiting for the second stage of sonship which consists above all in the deliverance of the body. While other perfections are to be expected with glorification, the freedom of the body from the constraints of mortality is the chief good. The centrality of physical transformation is indicated by the fact that inanimate nature also yearns to be delivered (cf. v. 22).

regards the outer σκηνή of the desert tabernacle (cf. 9,1-2.6), but the attainment of an absolute, i.e., the comparative form expresses not only a true comparative but also hints at the superlative use of the comparative found elsewhere in the letter and in the New Testament in general: the "more complete" tent is not only more complete than the outer tent of the desert tabernacle, it is finally and definitively complete in the designs of God⁽²²⁾. The word "tent" (σκηνή) used in conjunction with "not made with hands" (οὐ χειροποίητος) indicates a contrast with the "tent" (σκηνή) made by Moses (8,5)⁽²³⁾. Further, this "first" (πρώτη) tent was earthly, as opposed to the one "not of this creation" (9,11)⁽²⁴⁾. The symmetry between the two "tents" is not perfect: the tent made by Moses was something external to Moses, whereas the tent "through" (διὰ) which Christ entered was something proper to himself, since it is placed in parallel with his own blood "through" (διὰ) which he entered⁽²⁵⁾. The use of the phrase "more perfect" to modify "tent", together with the parallelism between "tent" and "blood", suggests that the word is here being used of the body of the risen Christ. Jesus is now anointed, is now fully "the

(22) Cf. SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 150, and M. ZERWICK, *Graecitas biblica Novi Testamenti exemplis illustratur* (Romae 1966) §§ 148-149 (pp. 49-50).

(23) This tent made by Moses is contrasted implicitly at 8,2 with the "true tent" which the "Lord" put up. The "Lord" here should be taken as God himself (cf. LXX Num 24,6). According to the interpretation being followed in this paper the resurrection is being alluded to.

(24) The contrast occurs again at 9,24 where Christ did not enter into the "holies made by hand" (χειροποίητα... ἅγια), which are the antitype of the true realities, but into "heaven" itself.

(25) Cf. Heb 9,11-12 where the preposition διὰ seems to have the same force with regard both to the "tent" and the blood: a "genetivus ejus rei cuius ope, usu, exercitio, efficacia, merito alqd. fit" (cf. F. ZORELL, *Lexicon graecum Novi Testamenti* [Cursus Scripturae Sacrae, Pars Prior, Libri introductorii VII; Paris 1961] cols. 286-287). Although the preposition has the same meaning in each instance, the nature of the object demands a different explanation for each phrase as a whole. With regard to the "tent", the preposition indicates what for want of a better term could be called "physical possibility", i.e., the glorified body is that by which Christ *can* gain entrance into τὰ ἅγια. With regard to the blood, the preposition indicates what for want of a better term should be called "cultic justification", i.e., the blood is that by which Christ *may* gain entrance into τὰ ἅγια legitimately in terms of the Mosaic Law. Obviously the basic problem here comes from the need to speak in categories about realities which are by their nature *sui generis*.

Christ", and in virtue of his "[more] complete" body he is now cultically empowered to stand before God in the definitive role assigned him in the Holy of Holies (τὰ ἅγια [τῶν ἁγίων]) — the words τὰ ἅγια in 9,12 seem to have this meaning — just as in virtue of his own blood he is entitled to enter into the Holy of Holies (cf. 9,7)⁽²⁶⁾.

2. *The Twofold Meaning of σκηνή in Hebrews*

What is happening in 9,11 is a play on words: σκηνή, "tent", is being used in the sense of σκῆνος, "tent", and in the sense of σκῆνος, "body"⁽²⁷⁾. The "tent" which Moses erected in the desert becomes a foreshadowing of the "tent" which is Christ's body. Whatever is behind this complicated use of imagery it is important enough to warrant the evocation of the "Holy Spirit": the Holy Spirit uses the liturgical restrictions involved in the distinction between the "first" (i.e., "outer") and "second" (i.e., "inner") tent to show that the way into the sanctuary (ἅγια) had not been "revealed" (φανερώω) as long as the outer tent still stood (9,6-8)⁽²⁸⁾. The symbolism associated here with the desert tabernacle is immediately applied to the "present time" (ἥτις παραβολή εἰς τὸν καιρὸν ἐνεστηκότα) and the incapacity of the contemporary Jewish cult to "complete" (τελειώω) the worshipper in regard to conscience (9,9).

3. *The Symbolism of the Outer Tent*

The point of the comparison involved in the play on words regarding σκηνή seems to be that the risen Christ is the new outer

⁽²⁶⁾ The word δευτέρα here is to be understood as the second part of the desert tabernacle, the tent called the "Holy of Holies" (Ἅγια Ἁγίων). Cf. 9,3.

⁽²⁷⁾ Such plays on words are not unknown to the New Testament (cf. Matt 16,18). On the meanings "tent" and "body" for σκῆνος cf. ZORELL, *Lexicon graecum Novi Testamenti*, col. 1210. The exceptional use of σκηνή for "body" on the analogy of σκῆνος offers no problem. Paul uses οἰκία in the sense of "body" at 2 Cor 5,1 although this is not a normal meaning.

⁽²⁸⁾ That is to say, by law access to the inner tent was severely limited: only the high priest once a year could enter it. The Spirit uses this arrangement as a visual parable expressing inadequacy. The substitution of the outer tent by the "greater and more perfect tent", i.e., Christ's risen body, which is the result of Christ's sacrifice in the Spirit (9,14), means that the era of limited access is at an end. The Spirit remedies in Christ what the Spirit had shown to be inadequate.

"tent" through whose (risen) "body" access to the second tent or Holy of Holies is now possible not just for the high priest on one day of the year but for all who believe in Christ. This interpretation is supported by the two uses of φανερώω in the epistle: the Holy Spirit used the complicated liturgy of the desert tabernacle to show that the way into the tabernacle (ἡ ὁδὸς τῶν ἁγίων) had not been "revealed" (φανερώω) — 9,6-8 with its attendant symbolism about the inefficacy of the contemporary Jewish cult referred to explicitly at 9,9; Christ, through his sacrifice at the completion of the age for the removal of sin, stands "revealed" — 9,26.

4. *The Symbolism of the Inner Tent*

With Christ's sacrifice of himself, then, the way of unrestricted access into the sanctuary has been revealed: it is Christ's risen body. With this risen body as his means, along with his own blood as his warrant⁽²⁹⁾, he entered once and for all into the Holy of Holies (9,12). If the outer tent of the desert sanctuary foreshadowed a Christian fulfillment, it seems plausible that the inner tent would have a similar fulfillment: an elaborate symbolism involving the access to the sanctuary would be pointless if the sanctuary itself did not have some elaborate symbolism.

5. *The Twofold Meaning of τὰ ἅγια*

A key to the solution as to a possible symbolism involving the sanctuary seems offered by 8,2, where the new high priest is presented as "minister τῶν ἁγίων and of the true tent". The expression τὰ ἅγια can bear two meanings, just as can ἡ σκηνή when used on the analogy of τὸ σκῆνος: it can mean either the "holy things" or "the sanctuary/Holy of Holies"⁽³⁰⁾. Based on the parallelism be-

⁽²⁹⁾ For a justification of the words "means" and "warrant" cf. above, note 25. For a different approach ending in the same conclusion about the nature of the "greater and more perfect tent" cf. A. VANHOYE, "'Par la tente plus grande et plus parfaite...' (He 9,11)", *Bib* 46 (1965) 1-28.

⁽³⁰⁾ For the use of ἅγιος (ἅγια) to designate sacred food in the LXX cf.: Lev 24,9 (the most relevant passage) and also Exod 29,32-33; Lev 10,12; 22,6-7.10.14.15-16; 2 Chr 35,6; 1 Sam 21,5 [1 Kings]; 2 Esdras 2,63; 17,65; 20,34. Cf. also Matt 7,6 and *Didache* 9,5. The text at *Testament of Levi* should be noticed: "The second washed me with clean water, and fed me

tween the two sets of words with twofold meanings, the point would then be that just as Christ's "completed", i.e., risen, body was the "means" of entering the sanctuary, thus replacing the outer tent, so the sanctuary/Holy of Holies into which he enters is really a corresponding reality, the "holy things" of Christianity. These "holy things" seem to be referred to at 8,3 with the words "gifts and sacrifices" (δωρά τε καὶ θυσίαι)⁽³¹⁾. Their old dispensation counterparts are referred to in 8,4 (δώρα) and 9,9 (δωρά τε καὶ θυσίαι)⁽³²⁾. Given the fact that Jesus offered himself (9,26.28), these "gifts and sacrifices" of the new dispensation are Jesus himself.

What all this complicated imagery adds up to seems to be this: that for the addressees the glorified body of Christ which they come into contact with as the eucharistic body is the concrete means given to them by Christ the new high priest of entering into the Holy of Holies, i.e., God's presence. Even at 9,24, where Christ is portrayed as entering into "heaven itself" (εἰς αὐτὸν οὐρανόν), heaven is viewed under the formality of God's presence (νῦν ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ) when it is contrasted with the ἅγια of the old dispensation. Just as the Holy of Holies of the desert tabernacle was considered as the place of meeting between God and his people, so the Christian fulfillment of this "antitype" (9,24) involves the

with bread and wine, the holiest things [ἅγια ἁγίων]..." (translated by the present writer, text after M. DE JONGE [ed.], *Testamenta XII Patriarcharum*. Edited according to Cambridge University Library MS Ff124 fol. 203a-216b with Short Notes [Leiden 1970] 15). Whether the phrase ἅγια ἁγίων is Jewish or Christian in this text is immaterial for the purpose of the present study: either possibility opens up intriguing perspectives. The use of τὰ ἅγια for the eucharistic mysteries is reflected also in the proclamation of the priest at the time of communion in Greek-language liturgical prayer: "Holy things for the holy! (τὰ ἅγια τοῖς ἁγίοις)" (cf. Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catecheses mystagogicae* 5,19 [in J. QUASTEN, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima* (Florilegium Patristicum 7; Bonn 1935-1937) 107 and 107, note 2]). Cf. SWETNAM, "Hebrews 9,9-10", 168-169.

⁽³¹⁾ This would seem to be the implication of γάρ at 8,3. But it should be noted that the "holy things" are associated in the text with the "gifts and sacrifices" and nothing more.

⁽³²⁾ For an attempt to come to grips with the imagery of Heb 9,10 in terms of the eucharist cf. SWETNAM, "Hebrews 9,9-10", 157-158. The present writer makes no claim to having arrived at a definitive explanation of such imagery; all that is claimed is that there is much more in the imagery than meets the eye and that the solution probably lies in the direction of a eucharistic interpretation.

place of meeting between God and his people, but in Christ⁽³³⁾. No reader of the epistle as it was first written would have been able to grasp this subtle symbolism without the aid of an oral tradition against which the epistle could have been interpreted. But there are other hints in the epistle itself which point to the need of a eucharistic interpretation if the letter is to be fully intelligible.

6. *Other Eucharistic Allusions in Hebrews*

a) Hebrews 9,20 and the Allusion to Exodus 24,8

One important hint that the author of Hebrews is interested in the eucharist is the allusion at 9,20 to the words of institution of the eucharist in the citation of Exod 24,8. Instead of writing ἰδοὺ τὸ αἶμα the author has written τοῦτο τὸ αἶμα, thus evoking the formula of consecration attributed to Jesus at the supper⁽³⁴⁾. By itself this viewing of Moses as a prefiguring of Jesus with regard to the eucharist seems too precious to merit serious concern. Its true force can be seen only in its context.

The immediate context of the eucharistic allusion at 9,20 is important. At 9,19-20 "every command having been spoken [λαλέω] according to the Law of Moses to the entire people", Moses proceeds to take blood and sprinkle "the book" and all the people, saying the words which allude to the eucharist. The entire scene seems intended to be a prefiguration of what Jesus did at the institution of the eucharist under the form of blood. At the institution Jesus took his own blood and metaphorically sprinkled "all the people" by the

⁽³³⁾ Cf. the remarks of O. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer* (MeyerK 13; Göttingen 81984): the phrase ἐμφανισθῆναι τῷ προσώπῳ τοῦ θεοῦ "könnte alttestamentlich-kultisch verstanden werden (der Fromme schaut im Tempel das Angesicht Gottes Ps 42: 3), könnte jüdisch-eschatologisch gedeutet werden, weil das Schauen des Angesichts höchste Seligkeit des Gerechten ist (Mt 5: 8), denkt aber in diesem Zusammenhang nur an den Gang des Hohenpriesters ins Allerheiligste. Dies Erscheinen ist erst seit der Erhöhung möglich, kennzeichnet aber die besondere Heilsbedeutung der Gegenwart (νῦν). Der letzte Sinn der Erscheinung Christi vor Gott ist in der schlichten Formulierung ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν umschlossen. Die Indirektheit und Verhülltheit des hellenistischen Ausdrucks weist auf einen Vorgang hin, der für den Verfasser von entscheidender Bedeutung ist" (324-325).

⁽³⁴⁾ Cf. Matt 26,28; Mark 14,24; Luke 22,20.

bestowal of the saving effects of his blood on "the many"⁽³⁵⁾. The occurrence of the important thematic word λαλέω should be noted.

b) The Thematic Word λαλέω

The thematic word λαλέω appears at 3,5 in a rich context. The passage is complicated. Three persons are involved: 1) God, who has "commissioned" (ποιέω) Jesus (3,2) and who is the ultimate "constructor" (κατασκευάζω) of everything; 2) Moses, who is the "servant" (θεράπων) in "all the house" and as such is linked with the house and merits less praise than Jesus because of this (3,3,5); 3) Jesus, who is "Son", and who has "constructed" (κατασκευάζω) a house and who is worthy of more honor than Moses because he has constructed the house and is "over" it (3,2.3.6)⁽³⁶⁾. The "house" is made up of Christians (3,6)⁽³⁷⁾. Jesus and Moses are thus placed in parallel, but as superior and inferior, both being under God. The thematic word λαλέω makes Moses as "servant" act as witness (εἰς μαρτύριον) of "the things to be spoken" (λαλέω). This use of the word λαλέω subtly modifies the relationship between Moses and Jesus from mere parallelism to prefiguration. The phrase "the things to be spoken" (τῶν λαληθησομένων) is of a piece with the use of λαλέω at 9,20. Moses is acting in prefiguration in both places⁽³⁸⁾.

(35) Cf. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 319-320. Michel notes the anachronism involved in speaking of sprinkling the σκηνή and the σκεύη. But Christ enters the true σκηνή "through his own blood" (9,12). NT realities are the determining norm for OT foreshadowings, as the reworking of the words of Moses at 9,20 indicate.

(36) "Wie Christus als das Wort Gottes Abglanz seiner Herrlichkeit ist, das All trägt, so ist er auch Erbauer des 'Hauses', verbirgt sich in den Aufträgen der Propheten und Engel, offenbart sich in der Gemeinde des Neuen Bundes als Sohn und Herr (3:5)" (MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 177).

(37) On the Christian community as the "house of God" cf. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 177-178.

(38) In 9,20 Moses is acting as θεράπων "in the entire house" (3,5), whereas Christ is son "over" the house when he institutes the eucharist and thus through the establishment of a new covenant "constructs" a new "house" composed of Christians (3,3,6). The ultimate "constructor" of everything is God (3,4). This hierarchy with regard to "constructing" seems to mirror the hierarchy with regard to "speaking": God "speaks" (λαλέω) in a son (2,1), who in turn is prefigured in the things which "will be spoken" (λαληθησομένων) (3,3) by Moses who speaks the words which have been

The phrase “things to be spoken” at 3,5, when viewed in connection with 9,20, suggests a eucharistic coloring to 3,1-6. This connection seems to be supported by the use of the word *παρρησία* at 3,6. For *παρρησία*, “assurance”, in Hebrews (it occurs there four times) seems to be associated with the right to enter into the Holy of Holies: this is clearly the case in 4,16⁽³⁹⁾ and 10,19⁽⁴⁰⁾. 10,35 seems to be intended as an explicit contrast to 3,6⁽⁴¹⁾. In 3,6 the Christians are said to constitute the “house” of Christ the son — the use of the word “Christ” with *υἱός* indicates that the risen Jesus is meant with all that this implies as regards the fullness of Sonship — if they maintain their assurance about entering into the Holy of Holies where the risen son has preceded them. It is thus that they constitute the dynasty (“house”) “constructed” by the Son. The allusion to Moses as foreshadowing with his words the institution of the eucharist is thus not foreign to the context of 3,5.

The sequence of God — Moses — Jesus is at the heart of the main theme of the epistle: God “spoke” (*λαλέω*) “in the prophets”⁽⁴²⁾ and now he “spoke” (*λαλέω*) “in a Son” (1,1)⁽⁴³⁾. At 13,7 this thematic use of *λαλέω* is prolonged so that the “word” (*λόγος*) of God is spoken by the Christians’ leaders to them. This transmission of a message from God to prophets to Jesus to Christians is

conformed to the eucharistic words of institution after every command has been “spoken” (*λαλέω*) according to the Law (9,19).

⁽³⁹⁾ “Dem Gnadenthron kann die Gemeinde nur dadurch nahen, dass sie das Wort von Jesus Christus als dem rechten Hohenpriester annimmt. Im Hören und Glauben ‘naht’ sie. An sich meint das Bild, das in der ganzen Antike bekannt ist, einen konkreten und realen Vorgang, der sich im Gottesdienst ereignet. μετὰ παρρησίας nimmt die Mahnung von 3:6 wieder auf; indem die Gemeinde das Wort vom rechten Hohenpriester annimmt, indem sie sich als Gemeinde der Sünder ausliefert, tut sie es in der ‘Freudigkeit’, im ‘Ermächtigtsein’, auch im ‘Vertrauen’ (vulg.: cum fiducia), in der Gewissheit, dass sie so handeln darf und muss... ‘Thron der Gnade’ ist hier im Hebr geradezu eine hebräische Umschreibung für Gott selbst; indem wir dem ‘Thron’ nahen, nahen wir Gott, nahen wir auch dem erhöhten Christus (Hebr 1:13 = Ps 110:1)” (MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 209).

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Marrow clearly notes in this context the relation between saving event and eschatological context (S. B. MARROW, “*Parrhēsia* and the New Testament”, *CBQ* 44 [1982] 440-441).

⁽⁴¹⁾ Cf. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 360.

⁽⁴²⁾ Moses is to be numbered among the “prophets” here referred to. Cf. VANHOYE, *Situation du Christ*, 59.

⁽⁴³⁾ Ibid., 60.

established at 2,3, where the “word” (λόγος) was “spoken” (λαλέω) through angels — an obvious allusion to the giving of the Law at Sinai⁽⁴⁴⁾ — and is placed in parallel with the “salvation” (σωτηρία) which had its “beginning of being spoken” (λαλέω) through the Lord and was then passed on by those who heard “to us” (εἰς ἡμᾶς). From this passage it is legitimate to infer that whatever began to be spoken by the Lord was 1) parallel to and in substitution of the Mosaic Law, 2) transmitted by word of mouth, and 3) central to the attainment of salvation⁽⁴⁵⁾.

c) The Twofold Meaning of λόγος

The aspects of Christian salvation mentioned above are reinforced by 13,7, where the “leaders” of the addressees are pictured as having “spoken” (λαλέω) to the addressees the “word of God” (ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ). Here the “salvation” appears as “the word” (ὁ λόγος), just as in the case of the Law. But this “word” is the replacement of the Law. It is transmitted by word of mouth through leaders. These leaders should be trusted and submitted to because they will have to render an “account” (λόγος) to God (13,17 — there seems to be a play on words with the λόγος of 13,7: speaking the “word” to Christians bears with it a grave responsibility)⁽⁴⁶⁾.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ Ibid., 233-235.

⁽⁴⁵⁾ The contrast between the angels and the Son which is so prominent in 1,5-14 is here subtly repeated in the contrasting phrases δι’ ἀγγέλων and διὰ τοῦ κυρίου. Cf. VANHOYE, *Situation du Christ*, 241-242. The dispensation begun by Christ is presented as being more important than the dispensation begun on Sinai.

⁽⁴⁶⁾ At 4,2 λόγος is used to describe the “good news” given to the desert generation (cf. 4,2 and 4,6). This good news is the same as that given the addressees of the epistle and includes the promise of entry into the land. In Hebrews, of course, this promised land is equivalent to eternal life (cf. SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 91 and note 25). Thus the ὁ λόγος τῆς ἀκοῆς is closely associated with σωτηρία (cf. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 192-193). It would seem that this λόγος of the “good news” and the “promise”, common to both the old and new dispensations, are important for understanding why the author of Hebrews uses the word λόγος to refer both to the Mosaic Law and to the Christian message which replaced it: both contain the element of salvation.

d) The Twofold Meaning of διαθήκη

This substitution of the λόγος of the new dispensation for the λόγος of the old is developed in the epistle under the term διαθήκη. The Sinai covenant is expressed as a διαθήκη (cf. 8,9; 9,4.15.20); it is replaced by a new and better διαθήκη (7,22; 8,6.8.10; 9,15.20; 10,16.29; 12,24; 13,20). The presence of διαθήκη at 9,20 is not contrary to the view that the eucharist is being alluded to there, for the texts of the institution of the eucharist always mention that it is a διαθήκη (Matt 28,28; Mark 14,24; Luke 22,20 [ἡ καὶνὴ διαθήκη]; 1 Cor 11,25 [ἡ καὶνὴ διαθήκη]). The allusion to the καὶνὴ διαθήκη of Jeremiah is evident in Luke and Paul.

The καὶνὴ διαθήκη is of considerable importance to the author of Hebrews, as is seen from the citation from Jeremiah at 8,8-12 and the emphasis given to the newness at 8,13, as well as from the citation at 10,16-17. Among the verses important for understanding how the author of Hebrews views the καὶνὴ διαθήκη are 9,15-18. These verses constitute a classic crux, for they use διαθήκη in two senses: in the sense of "covenant" (9,15.18) and in the sense of "testament" (9,16-17)⁽⁴⁷⁾. This is another instance of the author's play on words. The explanation of how he can go from one meaning to another with such insouciance seems to lie in the fact that he views the διαθήκη which he has in mind as a concrete reality, so that the attributes of both a covenant and of a testament can be predicated of it without contradiction: the eucharist is both a covenant and a testament⁽⁴⁸⁾. Christ can accordingly be presented as a successor to Moses in giving a new Torah which is also a testament.

e) Tabernacle and Tent as Antitype and Type

Finally, another image should be invoked in connection with the foreshadowing of Christ by Moses in the institution of the eucharist. In erecting the desert tabernacle which stands to the tent with which

⁽⁴⁷⁾ Cf. J. SWETNAM, "A Suggested Interpretation of Hebrews 9,15-18", *CBQ* 27 (1965) 373-390.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ Cf. J. SWETNAM, "Aspetti eucaristici del sangue di Cristo nell'epistola agli Ebrei: alcuni suggerimenti su Ebrei 9,20", *Atti della Settimana di Studi "Sangue e antropologia biblica nella letteratura cristiana"* (Roma, 29 novembre - 4 dicembre 1982) (ed. F. VATTIONI) (Centro Studi Sanguis Christi 2; Roma 1982) II, 845-846.

Jesus is concerned as “antitype” to “type” (cf. 8,5; 9,24; 8,2), Moses is doing something which for the author of the epistle clearly has an intrinsic connection. For reasons rehearsed above, this intrinsic connection seems to be eucharistic symbolism: the desert tabernacle which Moses constructed acted as an imperfect foreshadowing of the fullness of access to God which was to come only with the arrival of Jesus, apostle and high priest, who would finally make possible unrestricted access to God’s presence.

III. Other Relevant Texts

In the light of the foregoing discussion other passages in the epistle merit comment.

1. *Hebrews 6,4*

At 6,4 there is probably an allusion to the eucharist in the words “and having tasted the heavenly gift” (γευσάμενους τε τῆς δωρεᾶς τῆς ἐπουρανίου). There is no need to make an either-or choice of eucharistic allusion or non-eucharistic allusion. The principal meaning could well be a general, metaphorical reference to “tasting” God’s “gift” connected with the coming of Christ, while a specific connotation of the eucharist is sensed by the reader/listener⁽⁴⁹⁾.

2. *Hebrews 10,20*

At 10,20 the “flesh” (σάρξ) of Jesus is the “way” through the veil into the Holy of Holies, not the veil itself⁽⁵⁰⁾. The “way” into the sanctuary was made manifest only with the sacrifice of Christ (9,8.26), and Christ himself entered the sanctuary “through” his glorified body which was the victim offered in that sacrifice (9,11). It is the body which is the “way” and the veil which is the obstacle. For the addressees, the glorified body of Christ which they come into contact with as the eucharistic body is the concrete means of entering into the Holy of Holies, i.e., God’s presence.

⁽⁴⁹⁾ Cf. Acts 20,11.

⁽⁵⁰⁾ Cf. P. ANDRIESEN-A. LENGLET, “Quelques passages difficiles de l’Épître aux Hébreux (5,7.11; 10,20; 12,2)”, *Bib* 51 (1970) 214-215.

3. *Hebrews 13,10*

At 13,10 the author speaks of an "altar" from which those who worship "at the tent" (σκηνή) have no right to eat. An allusion to the eucharist can be argued even apart from the presentation made above. The "altar" alludes to the eucharist, and the use of the phrase "those who worship at the tent" to describe the worshippers at the temple shows that the imagery of the desert tabernacle developed in Chapter 8 is still governing the thought. And this, in turn, reinforces a eucharistic interpretation in Chapter 9⁽⁵¹⁾.

IV. The Spatial Imagery of Liturgical Function

Presupposed in the above view of the eucharist as involving the metaphor of spatial approach to describe coming to union with God are the terms "draw near to" (προσέρχομαι) and "enter" (εἰσερχομαι). The consistency of imagery with which these terms are used in the epistle suggests some underlying consistency of liturgical theology.

1. *The Imagery of "Approach"*

In 4,16 the addressees are urged to "draw near" (προσέρχομαι) the throne of grace of Jesus, the high priest, the "Son of God" (this phrase is important for it suggests Jesus in his perfected, post-resurrection Sonship)⁽⁵²⁾. In 7,25 the priesthood of Jesus is again invoked for all those who approach God through him because of his interces-

⁽⁵¹⁾ On the whole question of the various interpretations of the "altar" cf. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 498-503. Cf. especially his remarks on p. 500: "In unserem Zusammenhang verwendet Hebr zwei entscheidende Begriffe — Zelt und Altar — die vielleicht typologisch einem bestimmten Zusammenhang zuzuordnen sind, ohne sie genügend zu erklären. Offenbar waren sie dem Leser in ihrer Sinndeutung geläufiger als uns". Cf. also the important study of A. AALEN, "Das Abendmahl als Opfermahl im Neuen Testament", *NT* 6 (1963) 146-147. Also worth noting is E. L. RANDALL, "The Altar of Hebrews 13:10", *Australasian Catholic Record* 46 (1969) 197-208.

⁽⁵²⁾ MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 209, calls attention to the liturgical coloring of the passage (cf. above, note 39).

sory power. At 10,1 the word “approach” is used in connection with those who continuously come to God under the Law — it cannot bring them to “perfection” (τελειόω) no matter what sacrifices are offered. In 10,22 the addressees are exhorted to “approach” with their hearts and bodies cleansed — an allusion to baptism⁽⁵³⁾. At 11,6 the need for faith is emphasized for those who “approach” God: this exhortation sets the scene for the stress on the faith of the fathers in the list beginning with Abel. Finally, at 12,18.22 the Christians are said to have “approached” not Mount Sinai but the heavenly Jerusalem⁽⁵⁴⁾ in which Jesus is present as mediator of a new covenant (v. 24) (cf. the contrast between the Mosaic Law and the salvation brought through Christ at 2,2-3, 7,19, and 13,7, and the contrast between the two types of “covenant” in Chapters 7, 8, 9, and 10)⁽⁵⁵⁾.

The language associated with the word “approach” (προσέρχομαι) implies throughout a liturgical setting⁽⁵⁶⁾. The implication of the Christian “approach” to God is that it can result in the same perfection that has accrued to Christ through his resurrection.

2. *The Imagery of “Entrance”*

The ideas associated with the imagery of “entrance” (εἰσέρχομαι) involve two distinct but related sets of goals. In Chapters 3

⁽⁵³⁾ MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 346-347; C. SPICQ, *L'Épître aux Hébreux*, II (EB; Paris 1953) 317.

⁽⁵⁴⁾ MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 465, points out that the “church of the first-born” in 12,23 must still be on earth, for their names are written in heaven.

⁽⁵⁵⁾ SPICQ, *Hébreux*, II, 409, calls attention to the allusion to Exod 24 and the sprinkling of the blood by the mediator Moses (cf. Heb 9,20) through the mention of the sprinkling of blood and the mediator Jesus. In the context of the hypothesis being advanced in the present paper, this would constitute an allusion to the eucharistic blood, which speaks “better” than Abel’s because it purifies and saves in the presence of the judge (cf. 12,23). Cf. Michel’s remark that the allusion to Jesus’ blood at 12,24 must be understood in connection with the intercession of the high priest Jesus portrayed at Heb 7,25 (MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 469).

⁽⁵⁶⁾ “Rein kultisch ist das Wort [προσέρχομαι] in Hb u 1 Pt gebraucht” (J. SCHNEIDER, “προσέρχομαι”, *TWNT* II, 682).

and 4 the term of this "entry" is God's "Rest", i.e., eternal life⁽⁵⁷⁾. In Chapters 6 and 9 the term of this "entry" is the Holy of Holies viewed under the aspect of God's presence. The subject of the entry into God's Rest is the Christian people, successor to the desert generation who did not enter into God's Rest. The subject of the entry into the Holy of Holies is Jesus. But at 10,19-22 the Christians are urged to "approach" (προσέρχομαι) in a context strongly liturgical⁽⁵⁸⁾. And the goal of their approach is entrance (εἰσοδος) into the Holy of Holies to which they have access "in the blood of Jesus". It is the new covenant which makes definitive access to God possible, as is clear from the implied contrast in 7,19, again in a context clearly liturgical inasmuch as the allusion is to the priestly act of approaching God⁽⁵⁹⁾.

The theological framework of the author of Hebrews emerges from the above texts. The ultimate goal of the addressees is God's Rest into which they are to "enter in" (Chapters 3 and 4)⁽⁶⁰⁾. But before this definitive entrance into God's Rest there is the liturgy of "approaching" God, a liturgy couched in the imagery of the entrance of the Old Testament high priest into the Holy of Holies. The Christians are reminded that Jesus as the new high priest has definitively entered into the new Holy of Holies and they are urged to approach God's presence by doing likewise⁽⁶¹⁾. Various interpre-

(57) On the motive of God's "Rest" as eternal life cf. SWETNAM, *Jesus and Isaac*, 91 with note 25.

(58) Cf. above, note 53.

(59) Cf. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 273.

(60) SPICQ, *Hébreux*, II, 95-96.

(61) "Il va de soi que ce repos, don divin gratuit, devra être employé à remercier Dieu et à l'adorer. Aussi bien, dès l'origine, la notion de *manuḥa* en Israël est intrinsèquement liée à celle de culte" (SPICQ, *Hébreux*, II, 97). It must be recalled that the imagery of the Holy of Holies used in Hebrews is based on the desert sanctuary, not on the temple in Jerusalem, i.e., the entrance of the high priest into the Holy of Holies is connected with the pilgrimage to the definitive Rest. This is perhaps clearest at Heb 13,10. The Christian access to the Holy of Holies has the same ultimate orientation to entrance into God's Rest, but is broadened to include all those who "partake of Christ" the high priest (Heb 3,14) and deepened to include purification not simply of the body but of the heart as well (Heb 10,22). On the condition that faith not be lacking, this contact with God through Christ in the Holy of Holies will infallibly lead into the divine rest which is still waiting for those who will claim God's promise (Heb 3,12-19).

tations can be made as to what Christian reality the author had in mind. But in the context of the present paper it seems not unnatural to think of him as referring to the eucharist as a means of approaching God's presence through Jesus on the Christian journey which eventually will end with entrance into eternal life: entering into the Christian Holy of Holies and thus the presence of God available in this life through the means offered by Jesus' risen body prefigures entering into the definitive Rest of God to which entering the Holy of Holies is intrinsically ordered.

V. Concluding Remarks

Prescinding from a eucharistic interpretation of the epistle, it seems fair to say that a study of the various parallels and contrasts based on the presumption of a unified theological presentation shows the following: 1) God spoke through the prophets, especially Moses, in a way which prefigured his speaking in a Son, and this speaking was carried on beyond the Son, dependent upon his initiative, to those who heard him, and these in turn transmitted his message to the leaders of the addressees (1,1-2; 3,5; 9,19; 13,7); 2) the content of the speaking is parallel to and superior in dignity to the Mosaic Law (2,2-3) and it is so important that it can be termed "salvation" (2,3), i.e., it is in some way at the center of Christian living; 3) Moses in erecting the tent of meeting is pictured as in some way involved in erecting a prefiguring of a "type" shown to him which has relevance to the Christian cult (8,1-6); 4) the Christian *διαθήκη* is viewed as the fulfillment of the prophecy of Jeremiah regarding the new *διαθήκη* and is seen to be in contrast with the *διαθήκη* of the Mosaic dispensations (Chapters 8 and 9). Apart from any eucharistic interpretation these texts need explaining. What is the point of the use of the word *λαλέω* in a thematic way? What Christian reality is parallel to the Law? What is the purpose of the foreshadowing of the tent which Moses erected? In what way is the new *διαθήκη* different from the old, and what is the point of the contrast? Finally, how are these four aspects of the letter related to each other?

The present paper maintains that the common element which answers the above questions is the Christian eucharist. Such an interpretation also explains why there are plausible grounds for seeing eucharistic allusions at 9,20 and 13,7.

In fact, the eucharist emerges from the present study as a central point of the epistle⁽⁶²⁾. The author is speaking to people who have a good knowledge of the Scriptures and who are susceptible to argumentation based on Jewish exegetical suppositions. Apparently the addressees are tempted by disbelief in the presence of God among them in the form of the eucharist, and the author attempts to meet their doubts by showing that the eucharist is really the heir of ancient cultic practices involving God's presence and brought to their divinely-willed fulfillment in Christ. The Jewish disciples mentioned in John 6,66 who were unable to accept Jesus' teaching on the eucharist indicate the possible type of background which could have called forth the epistle. The indirection of the presentation is possibly required by the need to follow the usages of the "discipline of the secret"⁽⁶³⁾, or the indirection may simply be the result of the author's intuition that such indirection is more effective than unveiled statements and more in keeping with the august nature of the mystery he is trying to convey.

Pontifical Biblical Institute
Via della Pilotta, 25
00187 Rome, Italy

James SWETNAM, S.J.

⁽⁶²⁾ An objection to seeing the eucharist alluded to in the expression τὰ ἄγια τῶν ἁγίων may be raised on the supposition that the eucharist is for Christ a way to be present to Christians, not God (cf. 9,24 with reference to 9,12). Thus the analogy with the Holy of Holies is flawed from the outset. But this is to presume that the eucharist in the primitive church was exactly the same in this respect as it is now. Cf. F. CHENDERLIN, "Do This as My Memorial": *The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of Ἀνάμνησις in 1 Corinthians 11:24-25* (AnBib 99; Rome 1982).

⁽⁶³⁾ Cf. MICHEL, *Der Brief an die Hebräer*, 238-239. On the "discipline of the secret" cf. C. PERLER, "Arkandisziplin", *RAC* I, cols. 667-675, or id., "Arkandisziplin", *LTK* I, cols. 863-864. J. JEREMIAS, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus: An Investigation into Economic and Social Conditions during the New Testament Period* (London 1969; Fifth Impression, 1982) 240, remarks that "the whole section, [Heb] 6.3-10.18 reads like a lesson which must be revealed only to those capable of understanding Heb. 5.14 cf. Col. 2.2".

SOMMAIRE

Une interprétation eucharistique de certains passages-clé de l'épître aux Hébreux devient plus facile si l'on considère la «perfection» conférée au Christ par sa résurrection. Son corps reçoit des qualités dont ne jouissait pas son corps physique et selon l'épître c'est «par» ce corps ressuscité («la tente plus grande et plus parfaite») que le Christ entre dans le saint des saints (τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων). L'article met en valeur un jeu de mots sur τὰ ἅγια en sorte que deux désignations s'ensuivent: le saint des saints de la tente du désert et les «choses saintes» (nourriture) de la tradition juive. La récurrence, dans l'épître, de semblables jeux de mots ainsi que d'autres thèmes, appuient cette interprétation.

ANIMADVERSIONES

The Departure for Jerusalem (Luke 9,51-56) as a Rhetorical Imitation of Elijah's Departure for the Jordan (2 Kgs 1,1-2,6)

The origin of the departure account (Luke 9,51-56) has always been something of a puzzle. Though the text is quite striking — it tells both of Jesus setting his face to go to Jerusalem, and of James and John wanting to call down fire from heaven — it is not at all clear whence Luke drew the account. It is not found in Mark, and apparently did not come from Q. One is left wondering whether it is derived from the hypothetical and hazy "L" source, or whether, perhaps, it is, to some degree at least, the result of Luke's "free creative activity"⁽¹⁾. In 1984 the puzzle received a new angle: David Flusser suggested that much of the passage, especially 9,51-53, is derived from a Hebrew fragment⁽²⁾.

The purpose of this article is to indicate that the origin of the departure account need not remain so mysterious. To a significant degree it is derived from a text which, far from being lost, is quite familiar — the account which introduces and describes the departure of Elijah for the Jordan (2 Kgs 1,1-2,6). However, unlike the OT text with its division into two episodes — one emphasizing death (2 Kings 1), and the other, assumption (2 Kgs 2,1-6) — the Lukan text integrates the ideas of death and assumption into a single episode which is brief and relatively clear (9,51-56). Thus, what is being proposed is that the two parts of the OT text have been fused, and that the text as a whole has been reshaped, particularly through being abbreviated and improved. Luke's basic procedures, of fusion, abbreviation and improvement, should probably be seen as part of the rhetorical practice of imitating and emulating existing texts, especially ancient texts. That Luke really did this is indicated by the likelihood that he was practiced in rhetoric, by his tendency to use and imitate the LXX, particularly the Elijah-Elisha narrative, and especially by the complex coherence of the similarities between the actual texts.

⁽¹⁾ For a discussion of "L", of Luke's creative activity, and of the possible origin of Luke 9,51-56, see J. A. FITZMYER, *The Gospel According to Luke I-IX* (AB; Garden City NY 1981) 82-85, 826-827. See also the useful discussion of I. H. MARSHALL, *The Gospel of Luke* (Grand Rapids 1978) 403-404.

⁽²⁾ "Lukas 9,51-56 — Ein hebräisches Fragment", *The New Testament Age: Essays in Honor of Bo Reicke* (ed. W. C. WEINRICH) (2 vols.; Macon, GA 1984) I, 165-179.

The article consists of six parts: (I) A minuscule summary of the widespread practice of imitation. (II) A summary of the arguments which suggest that Luke engaged in imitation, particularly imitation of the Elijah-Elisha narrative. (III) An introductory analysis of 2 Kgs 1,1-2,6 and Luke 9,51-56. (IV) A detailed analysis. (V) A summary of the similarities, differences and adaptations. (VI) Conclusion.

I. The Central Role of Imitation

Introductions to literary imitation may be found elsewhere⁽³⁾. All that is given here is a brief summary.

In order to understand the origin of most of the literature of the Greco-Roman world it is necessary to understand imitation. Unlike modern writers, who tend to emphasize originality, ancient writers generally put the emphasis on imitation, on the adapting of existing texts. It was a practice which was central until the latter part of the eighteenth century — until the development, that is, of individual-centered romanticism⁽⁴⁾, and until the publication, in 1759, of Edward Young's "Conjectures on Original Composition"⁽⁵⁾.

The origin, as a practice, may perhaps go back to the early stages of the history of writing, to a time when every text was treasured⁽⁶⁾, but as an articulated theory it was developed by the rhetoricians of Greece and Rome⁽⁷⁾. The word itself (Gk., *mīmēsis*; Latin, *imitatio*) enjoyed immense prestige for it had been used by Plato to describe all of reality — reality is an imitation of a higher world⁽⁸⁾ — and by Aristotle to describe all of art — "art imitates nature"⁽⁹⁾. Incidentally it is in this latter, Aristotelian, sense that E. Auerbach⁽¹⁰⁾ uses the word *mīmēsis*. Quite different however from the Aristotelian sense was that of Aristotle's older contemporary, Isocrates. It was he apparently who first articulated the idea that rhetoric, which included literary

⁽³⁾ For a survey and analysis of the relevant classical texts, see T. M. GREENE, *The Light in Troy. Imitation and Discovery in Renaissance Poetry* (New Haven - London 1982) 54-80. For a general introduction to imitation, see T. L. BRODIE, "Greco-Roman Imitation of Texts as a Partial Guide to Luke's Use of Sources", *Luke-Acts. New Perspectives from the Society of Biblical Literature* (ed. C. H. TALBERT) (New York 1984) 17-46.

⁽⁴⁾ See W. J. ONG, *Rhetoric, Romance and Technology* (Ithaca, NY - London 1971) 255-283, esp. 255-261.

⁽⁵⁾ Young's essay is reprinted in C. KAPLAN, *Criticism: The Major Statements* (New York 1975) 220-250.

⁽⁶⁾ See ONG, *Rhetoric, Romance*, 277-279; BRODIE, "Greco-Roman Imitation", 17.

⁽⁷⁾ See esp. GREENE, *The Light in Troy*, 54-80.

⁽⁸⁾ See esp. Plato's *Republic* III, 392 D—394 C; VI, 500 C—E.

⁽⁹⁾ See esp. Aristotle's *Physics*, II, 2.194a 22; II, 8.199a 15-17; *Poetics* IX, 1451b 9.

⁽¹⁰⁾ E. AUERBACH, *Mimesis. The Representation of Reality in Western Literature* (Princeton 1968).

composition, should imitate previous rhetoric⁽¹¹⁾. By the time one gets to the general period in which the gospels were written, during the era of Quintilian, imitation has a central role⁽¹²⁾, and among modern scholars of antiquity it is taken for granted that much of Latin writing consists of a reworking of ancient Greek writing⁽¹³⁾.

Imitation involved not only form but also content⁽¹⁴⁾. And it was not slavish. In imitating a text, one of the basic purposes was to go beyond it to produce something better — so much so that eventually imitation became synonymous with emulation or rivalry (Gk., *zēlos*; Lat., *emulatio*)⁽¹⁵⁾.

Among the many techniques employed in the process of imitation the most basic were modernization, abbreviation, elaboration, division and fusion⁽¹⁶⁾. Modernization, abbreviation and elaboration seem self-explanatory. Division consisted of taking a text, breaking it into segments, and then using the various segments as starting-points for the construction of diverse passages. Fusion consisted of blending passages that were originally distinct. These basic techniques, and many others, were used in a wide variety of ways. Ultimately there was no clear limit on what the imitator could and could not do in reworking a text.

Imitation was not something specialized. Just as rhetoric was pervasive in the Greco-Roman literary world, so also was imitation. It was one of the first rules of literary composition⁽¹⁷⁾ and is found in every genre⁽¹⁸⁾.

II. Luke and the Imitating of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative

There are several factors which, when taken together, suggest that Luke imitated the Elijah-Elisha narrative.

Given the pervasiveness of rhetoric in the first century AD, and given also the presence in Luke's text of specific rhetorical devices, there is a probability that Luke had some education in rhetoric⁽¹⁹⁾. In fact it is difficult to see how he could be a writer in the Hellenistic mold — which he is generally

⁽¹¹⁾ See esp. Isocrates' *Against the Sophists*, 17-18. On the influence of Isocrates, see A. LESKY, *A History of Greek Literature* (New York 1968) 582-592.

⁽¹²⁾ See esp. Quintilian, *Inst. Orat.*, X, i and ii.

⁽¹³⁾ See, for instance, J. HIGGINBOTHAM, *Greek and Latin Literature. A Comparative Study* (London 1969).

⁽¹⁴⁾ For examples of diverse ways of reworking content see, for example, G. N. KNAUER, *Die Aeneis und Homer* (Hypomnemata 7; Göttingen 1964); N. ZUMWALT, "Fama Subversa: Theme and Structure in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 12", *California Studies in Classical Antiquity* 10 (1977) 209-222.

⁽¹⁵⁾ See, for example, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Lysias*, 3-4.

⁽¹⁶⁾ For a summary discussion of the techniques of imitation see GREENE, *The Light in Troy*, 54-80, and BRODIE, "Greco-Roman Imitation", 19-32.

⁽¹⁷⁾ Cf. G. KENNEDY, *The Art of Persuasion in Greece* (Princeton 1963) 332-333.

⁽¹⁸⁾ See esp. HIGGINBOTHAM, *Greek and Latin Literature*.

⁽¹⁹⁾ For discussion and basic bibliographical references, see W. S. KURZ, "Hellenistic Rhetoric in the Christological Proof of Luke-Acts", *CBQ* 42 (1980) 171-195, esp. 184-195.

taken to be — unless he had learned rhetoric. And, as already mentioned, one of the first rules of rhetoric was imitation.

There are indications that Luke did in fact imitate an ancient document — the LXX. His style has been described as an imitation of LXX style⁽²⁰⁾, and there are a number of areas, particularly Luke 1,1-4,30⁽²¹⁾ and the Stephen speech⁽²²⁾, which show heavy indebtedness to the LXX content.

It is within this context — the likelihood that Luke knew rhetoric and his indebtedness to the LXX — that the question arises whether he imitated the Elijah-Elisha narrative.

It is of some significance that Luke-Acts, in so far as it is a two-part work and is centered around an assumption into heaven, has the same general organization as the Elijah-Elisha narrative. It also seems significant that in the programmatic Nazareth speech (Luke 4,16-30), the models which are singled out are Elijah and Elisha. Furthermore, there are a number of passages, especially in Luke 7 and Acts 6-8, which appear to reflect systematic imitation of the Elijah-Elisha narrative⁽²³⁾.

The imitation of the Elijah-Elisha narrative in major parts of Luke 7 is particularly significant when discussing Luke 9,51-56. For there is a certain unity between Luke 7,1-8,3 and Luke 9,51-56: both belong to the non-Marcan sections of Luke. In fact if Luke had not incorporated a major Marcan block (Luke 8,4-9,50; cf. Mark 3,31-9,40), the account of the departure for Jerusalem would follow immediately on Luke 7,1-8,3. So what suggests itself is that if the Lucan text which immediately precedes the Marcan block contains systematic imitations of the Elijah-Elisha narrative, then perhaps the same is true of the text which immediately follows.

When one asks which part, if any, of the Elijah-Elisha narrative has been used in composing the departure account, there are clues which, almost immediately, draw attention to the opening chapters of 2 Kings: the assumption of Jesus is generally linked, indirectly at least, with the assumption of Elijah (2 Kings 2); and the idea of calling down fire from heaven, which is part of the departure account (cf. Luke 9,54-55), is generally linked, in some way, with the action of Elijah in 2 Kings 1. It seems reasonable therefore to ask

⁽²⁰⁾ E. PLÜMACHER, *Lukas als hellenistischer Schriftsteller* (SUNT 9; Göttingen 1971) 38-72, esp. 63-64; F. L. HORTON, "Reflections on the Semitisms of Luke-Acts", *Perspectives on Luke-Acts* (ed. C. H. TALBERT) (Danville, VA 1978) 1-23, esp. 17-18.

⁽²¹⁾ See T. L. BRODIE, "A New Temple and a New Law: The Unity and Chronicler-based Nature of Luke 1:1-4:22a", *JSNT* 5 (1979) 21-45.

⁽²²⁾ See esp. E. RICHARD, *Acts 6:1-8:4. The Author's Method of Composition* (SBLDS 41; Missoula 1978).

⁽²³⁾ See T. L. BRODIE, "Towards Unraveling Luke's Use of the Old Testament: Luke 7:11-17 as an *Imitatio* of 1 Kings 17:17-24", *NTS* 32 (1986) 247-267; "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37: A Study in Luke's Use of Rhetorical Imitation", *Bib* 64 (1983) 457-485; "The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth (1 Kgs 21:8-23) as One Component of the Stephen Text (Acts 6:9-14; 7:58a)", *CBQ* 45 (1983) 417-432; "Towards Unraveling the Rhetorical Imitation of Sources in Acts: 2 Kings 5 as One Component of Acts 8,9-40", *Bib* 67 (1986) 41-67.

whether Luke 9,51-56, apart from its specifically Christian sources, involves also an imitating of the beginning of 2 Kings.

III. 2 Kgs 1,1-2,6 and Luke 9,51-56: Introductory Analysis

The OT text is part of a larger unit — the two-episode account which tells first of the death of the king, Ahaziah (2 Kgs 1,1-17, LXX)⁽²⁴⁾, and then of the assumption of Elijah (2 Kgs 2,1-18).

The account of the death of the king involves a considerable mixture of elements. He falls from an upper story and when he sends messengers from Samaria to Ekron to consult Baalzebub about his prospects of recovery, Elijah stops the messengers and sends them back to say that the Lord has decreed Ahaziah's death. When Ahaziah sends fifty soldiers out from Samaria to apprehend Elijah, the prophet calls down fire from heaven to destroy them, but eventually he relents and goes into Samaria where he reiterates the decree of death. And in accordance with the word of the Lord, Ahaziah dies.

The second episode tells of Elijah and Elisha going, stage by stage, from Gilgal to the Jordan, and it describes how, amid the muted statements and observing eyes of the prophets, Elijah was taken up to heaven.

The unity of these two episodes is not immediately obvious. King Ahaziah's death may seem like a freakish accident which has nothing to do with the grandiose nature of Elijah's ascent to heaven. But there is increasing evidence that biblical episodes which at first sight may seem unrelated do in fact have a deep-seated unity. A good example is provided by the story of Joseph (Genesis 37 and 39-50) and the apparently unrelated story of Tamar (Genesis 38). It has been shown by Robert Alter that the two have been so constructed so as to form a sophisticated and coherent unity⁽²⁵⁾. Something similar may be observed in the episodes concerning the king's death and Elijah's assumption. Examination of the two events begins to uncover several points of contact or contrast. Like the death, the assumption is described repeatedly as something decreed or planned by God (2 Kgs 1,4.6.16; 2,1.3.5). The most dramatic ingredient in both accounts is fire — fire which descends from heaven and brings death (1,9-14), and fire which, in a life-giving way, sweeps someone up to heaven (2,11). And there are other interrelated points of contact: the motif of the identifying or recognizing of Elijah (1,17; 2,10.12); the motif of locating the true God, the God of Elijah (1,3; 2,14); and finally, the motif of a useless quest and of a quest involving fifty people (1,2b.5.9.11.13; 2,7.16-18). Even the mode of death — a fall (1,2) — would seem to provide a contrast to the image of the taking up. Furthermore, as Elijah is approaching or is about to approach the places of death and as-

⁽²⁴⁾ 2 Kgs 1,18 is a stereotypical addendum which adds little to the narrative.

⁽²⁵⁾ See R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York 1979) 3-22, esp. 10.

sumption the structure of the narratives is repetitious and threefold (1,9-14; 2,1-6).

A full investigation would require a distinct article, and, even with that, some of the details would probably remain questionable. Yet it seems reasonable to draw a minimal conclusion: that, as the juxtaposing of the two episodes suggests, there is between them some inherent connection. And the best way to summarize that connection is to say that the two episodes are like complementary aspects of one reality, and that in their different ways they point to a single theme: God's power over everything, and particularly the way in which the divine word encompasses both death and life.

The NT text describes briefly how Jesus faced both death and assumption: "When the time was fulfilled for his being taken up he set his face to go to Jerusalem". He sent messengers ahead of him and was rejected by a Samaritan village, but, despite the suggestion of James and John he did not call down fire from heaven; instead, he rebuked them and went to another village.

<i>2 Kgs 1,1-2,6</i>	<i>Luke 9,51-56</i>
	As the time is fulfilled for his taking up... (51a)
The king's death is divinely decreed (1,1-2a.4.6b.15-17)	... Jesus sets his face to go to Jerusalem (51b)
He sends messengers... from Samaria to Ekron... to inquire about his future (2b)	He sends messengers... to Samaria... to prepare for him (52)
The messengers are turned back because of their destination (Ekron) (3.5-6a)	He is not received because of his destination (Jerusalem) (53)
The calling of fire from heaven (7-14)	The idea of calling fire from heaven is rejected (54-55)
At the time of his assumption Elijah sets out on a journey (2,1)	
Elijah and Elisha go from place to place — en route to the Jordan (2,2-6)	Jesus and company go to another village (en route to Jerusalem) (56)

What Luke has done is blend the two parts of the OT text. In other words, instead of leaving the reader with the problem of putting the two texts together — a problem which for most readers may be baffling — he takes the

initiative in synthesizing them. A rather similar procedure is found in his reworking of the two stories in 2 Kgs 4,1-37⁽²⁶⁾. The process is not one which destroys the OT text, but rather one which clarifies its meaning.

He does not, however, make use of the climactic section of the second episode — the actual assumption of Elijah (2 Kgs 2,7-18). He holds that over and uses it, in distilled form, for other purposes, particularly to provide a skeletal framework for describing the actual taking up of Jesus (Luke 24,50; Acts 1,9-10)⁽²⁷⁾.

What remains, therefore, is 2 Kgs 1,1-2,6. It is this which provides a foundational component for Luke 9,51-56.

An outline of the relationship between the texts is given on the preceding page. It is considerably simplified, yet, once that limitation is borne in mind, it may serve as a useful stepping-stone towards a more complete analysis.

IV. 2 Kgs 1,1-2,6 and Luke 9,51-56: Detailed Analysis

1. *The Lord's plan(s) of death and assumption, and the departure* (2 Kgs 1,1-2a.4.6b.15-17; 2,1; Luke 9,51)

The OT shows the Lord (*kyrios*) as having two plans — one for the imminent death of King Ahaziah, and the other for the taking up of Elijah. The image of someone dying is placed at the beginning and end of the chapter (vv. 1.17), and the decree of death is spelled out, solemnly, three times: "... Thus says the Lord... You shall surely die... You shall surely die... You shall surely die" (vv. 4.6b.15-17). It is because the references to death are so repetitious and unified that one is justified in suggesting that they be taken as a unit.

The Lord's second plan — for taking up Elijah — is recounted in 2,1: "Now when the Lord was about to take Elijah up to heaven by a whirlwind...". And the text goes on to emphasize, in an account which is almost as repetitious as the death decree, that the Lord is really going to do it (cf. 2,3.5).

The NT suggests the presence of a single plan, the plan for the assumption (*analēmpsīs*) of Jesus: "When the days were drawing near [literally, "were being filled up", *en tō symplērōsthai*] for him to be taken up, he set his face...".

Luke's text involves several adaptations. First, fusion. Instead of two plans or decrees, one for death and one for the taking up, he indicates a single plan which involves both. He does not of course explicitly refer to

⁽²⁶⁾ BRODIE, "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37", esp. 468-479.

⁽²⁷⁾ For a summary account of the relationship of Jesus' ascension to Elijah's assumption, see T. L. BRODIE, "Luke-Acts as an Imitation and Emulation of the Elijah-Elisha Narrative", forthcoming in *Studies in Luke-Acts* (ed. E. RICHARD) (Wilmington, probably 1989).

Jesus as going to his death, but the word "assumption" is sufficiently broad to include such a meaning⁽²⁸⁾ and the setting of the face, as well as the subsequent account, indicate that he was in fact taking the road to his death.

Second, geographical adaptation. The idea of a journey, stage by stage, to a location across the Jordan (cf. 2 Kgs 2,1-6), is adapted to suit Jesus' journey to Jerusalem.

Third, abbreviation. Instead of the prolonged triple death decree Luke gives a single phrase: "he set his face". Curiously, however, he uses the word "face", *prosōpon*, three times (vv. 51.52.53) — a frequency not matched elsewhere in the NT. And it is also curious that Elijah had been told not to fear the face (*prosōpon*) of the man who asked him to come down to the dying king (2 Kgs 2,15). The question which arises — and which at this stage seems difficult to answer — is whether Luke took the idea of not fearing a face, turned it into that of a face which did not fear ("he set his face"), and then, in an echo of the triple death decree, used the word "face" three times. Rather similar adaptations may be found in Luke's rewriting of other OT texts⁽²⁹⁾.

Apart from these adaptations, a number of other factors, some of them quite subtle, seem to have influenced the reworking of the source and the shaping of the final text. The actual phrasing, "he set his face", apart from its relationship to 2 Kings 1, may also reflect some other OT text⁽³⁰⁾. Furthermore, the associating of Jesus' (implied) death with the "filling up" of time seems to be part of Luke's larger strategy of associating Jesus' death with a process of providential fulfilment (cf. Luke 24,7.26-27.44-46). And there is another detail: instead of depicting the Lord as being the mere source of the plan(s), the NT shows the Lord (*kyrios*, 9,54) as being *personally involved* in the plan.

What is essential is that, even though, within the Bible as a whole, there are indeed three other references to people being taken away (Enoch in Gen 5,24; and Elijah in 1 Macc 2,58 and Sir 48,9), there are no other biblical texts, apart from 2 Kgs 2,1 and Luke 9,51, which speak of the one who is soon to be assumed as journeying to the fated place. Nor are there any other biblical texts which place the image of assumption so close to the image or idea of death. The link is unique.

Even in the wording there is significant similarity:

OT: καὶ ἐγένετο ἐν τῷ ἀνάγειν Κύριον τὸν Ἡλίου ἐν συνσεισμῷ ὥς εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, καὶ ἐπορεύθη...

NT: Ἐγένετο δὲ ἐν τῷ συμπληροῦσθαι τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναλήψεως... τοῦ πορεύεσθαι...

⁽²⁸⁾ For discussion, see FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 828, and esp. MARSHALL, *Luke*, 405.

⁽²⁹⁾ See esp. Luke's intricate reworking of certain aspects of the Naaman text (BRODIE, "2 Kings 5 as One Component of Acts 8,9-40", 54-58) and the compact adaptation, in Luke 3,10-16, of the threefold form of Nehemiah 5,1-4 (BRODIE, "New Temple and New Law", 40).

⁽³⁰⁾ For discussion, see FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 828.

Instead of the complex idea of taking someone up to heaven in a *synseismos*, "whirlwind", Luke has substituted the single word *analempsis*, "taking up", and has then refined the phrasing so that it both synthesizes the OT text and fits into the pattern of his overall work. It prepares the way for the fact that in Acts 1,2.11.22 Jesus is described as being "taken up".

2. *The sending of the messengers (2 Kgs 1,2b; Luke 9,52)*

Faced with prospect of death, the king sent messengers from Samaria to Ekron to inquire about his future, more specifically to ask if he would live. And as Jesus faced Jerusalem, he also sent messengers before him, and they went into a Samaritan village to prepare for him. Thus in different ways both texts tell of messengers who are concerned about the future of someone who is going to die⁽³¹⁾.

One may well ask why the theme of death, which is so explicit in 2 Kings 1, is rendered so cryptically in Luke 9,51. The explanation, partly at least, seems to lie in the fact that Luke is adapting the theme to the larger requirements of his narrative. Within that narrative, death will indeed eventually become a major and explicit theme; in fact, along with the idea of resurrection and assumption, it will become, to some degree, *the* major focus of the gospel story. But for the moment it is in the distance, and it is appropriate that Luke introduce it gradually⁽³²⁾. In other words the precise

⁽³¹⁾ To say that the NT messengers are interested only in the practicalities of finding lodging does not do justice to the text. The context indicates that Jesus is journeying, not just towards a lodging place, but towards his ultimate dread fate. Such a suggestion is strengthened by the fact that the messengers are going "before his face", a phrase which, in the context, links their mission with the setting of his face towards death. And the rejection of Jesus, "because his face was set towards Jerusalem", reinforces the idea of a link between their mission and his facing of death. This does not deny a practical dimension to their mission, nor does it take away from the fact that, historically, the Samaritans were indeed hostile to Jerusalem-bound travellers, but neither does that historical dimension which is now woven into the fabric of the gospel negate the fact that the present text, concerning Jesus' journey and concerning the disciples' process of preparation, connects the preparation process with Jesus' setting of his face towards death. It is probably not a coincidence that the word "prepare", *hetoimazō*, occurs most frequently not at the beginning of Luke's gospel but near its conclusion, in death-related contexts — in preparing for the Passover (22,8.9.12.13) and for burial (23,56; 24,1). Apparently as the Jerusalem journey begins, Luke is already intimating what the Emmaus journey will eventually say more clearly — that death has to be faced, that it is prepared for in Scripture, and, by implication, that it is something for which every traveller should be prepared (cf. Luke 24,13-35). In any case, whatever the final details, there are significant indications that the messengers in Luke's text, like those in the OT passage, are on a mission which reflects the fact that the one who sent them is facing death.

⁽³²⁾ The principle of gradualness seems important in much biblical composition. It appears to be present in the Pentateuch's gradual unfolding of plot and theme, and may perhaps also be present in the elusive composition of Jeremiah — in the steady circular advance from the virtual absence of prose narrative (Jeremiah 2-6) to the increasingly vivid narrative of the final events (Jeremiah

reshaping of the subtext (2 Kings 1) has been adapted to the fact that Luke has a distinct narrative focus. The same principle was used in his reworking of the Naboth text to describe the fate of Stephen⁽³³⁾. Thus Luke has taken the OT text, sifted its death-related essence, and rendered it to suit the context of Jesus' journey to Jerusalem.

Apart from this general thematic similarity, there are also similarities which are linguistic:

OT: καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους... καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ἐπερωτῆσαι δι' αὐτοῦ.

NT: καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ἀγγέλους πρὸ προσώπου αὐτοῦ καὶ πορευθέντες εἰσήλθον... ὡς ἐτοιμάσαι αὐτῷ.

Some of the details of this resemblance are debatable, but others are striking. Even though the two words *apostellō* and *aggelos*, "I send" and "messenger/angel", are extremely common, the unbroken phrase found here, *kai apesteilen aggelous*, "and he sent messengers/angels", does not occur elsewhere in the NT. Even in the OT it is rare — apparently there are just five other occurrences (Judg 9,31; 1 Sam 19,21; 2 Sam 3,26; 1 Chr 19,2.16)⁽³⁴⁾. And there is no other instance, even in the OT, where the phrase "and he sent messengers/angels" is followed by the verb *poreuomai*, "I go/journey". Thus, ordinary as the words may be, the linguistic link between the texts is unique.

3. The mission is turned back (2 Kgs 1,3.5-6a; Luke 9,53)

As the king's messengers are on their way from Samaria to Ekron, Elijah stops them and rebukes them for going (*poreuomai*) to consult such an alien deity. And when Jesus comes to the village of the Samaritans, he is not received because he is going (*poreuomai*) to Jerusalem.

In both cases the mission runs into a religious antagonism: Elijah could not accept the Ekron deity; and the Samaritans could not accept the worship of Jerusalem. Therefore the missions were turned back. What Luke has done then, is take an ancient antagonism and replace it with one from the time of Jesus. This accords with what he does elsewhere, with the fact, for instance, that in using the Naboth story to describe the fate of Stephen, he

32-45). It is a phenomenon which should probably be linked to the poetic process of intensification (cf. R. ALTER, *The Art of Biblical Poetry* [New York 1985] 13-26, 62-84). It certainly appears to be present in the gospel of John, a document which is frequently referred to as spiralling, and the themes of which have been described as advancing gradually "like the waves of the rising tide" (M.-Fr. LACAN, "Le Prologue de Saint Jean. Ses thèmes, sa structure, son mouvement", *LumVie* 33 [1957] 91-110, esp. 97). The presence of some such phenomenon in Luke-Acts is suggested by the work of R. C. TANNEHILL, "The Composition of Acts 3-5: Narrative Development and and Echo Effect", *Seminar Papers* (ed. K. H. RICHARDS) (SBLASP 23; Chico 1984) 217-240.

⁽³³⁾ BRODIE, "The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth", 424.

⁽³⁴⁾ There are about thirty instances of very minor variations on the phrase in question (e.g. cf. Num 20,14; 22,10; Josh 7,22; Judg 7,24; 11,19).

replaces the ancient institutions of Naboth's time with institutions from the time of Stephen⁽³⁵⁾.

Of course he also makes other adaptations, particularly that of abbreviation. The rather long description of turning back the OT messengers is replaced by the brief phrase "they would not receive him". Not only does "not receive" synthesize the essence of the OT text but it also prepares the way for the fact that those sent out later may perhaps not be received (Luke 10,10). Thus once again Luke is simultaneously synthesizing the OT and adapting it to the shape of his own narrative.

4. *Calling fire from heaven* (2 Kgs 1,7-14; Luke 9,54-55)

When soldiers from Samaria approach Elijah he twice calls down fire on them, but on the third occasion, when the captain pleads for mercy, he relents. In the NT, when James and John suggest calling down fire on the Samaritans, Jesus turns and rebukes them.

Luke's account involves both drastic abbreviation and sharp reversal. But these adaptations are not without purpose: they reduce an elaborate and frightening account to a brief picture of mercy — a picture which is in accord with Luke's overall approach.

Despite these changes the two texts show a unique resemblance. Nowhere else in the Bible is there quite the same image of calling down from heaven a fire which consumes. The resemblance is reinforced by the fact that in both cases the (potential) victims are from the same area, Samaria.

The verbal similarity is considerable:

OT: καταβήσεται πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ καταφάγεται... (twice)
 ... καὶ κατέβη πῦρ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ κατέφαγεν... (three times)
 καὶ... ἐντιμώθητω... (twice).
 NT: πῦρ καταβῆναι ἀπὸ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ ἀναλῶσαι...
 ... ἐπετίμησεν.

Most of this similarity is easy to see: Luke has abbreviated the OT wording and has replaced *kataphagetai/katephagen* with the synonymous *analōsai*. What is more difficult to judge is whether Luke's use of *epitimaō*, "I rebuke", involves a word-play on *entimoō*, "I honor/value". Despite their difference in meaning the words are related. They occur in similar contexts — towards the end of the fire-from-heaven passages (cf. 2 Kgs 1,13-14; Luke 9,55) — and they are used for exactly the same purpose — to prevent fire from descending. The captain of the third group, seeing that fire has already twice descended, pleads with Elijah to *value* him and not call down fire. And when Jesus hears that James and John are threatening to call down fire he *rebukes* them. In other words, it is the processes of valuing (*entimoō*) and of rebuking (*epitimoō*) which stop the fire. The idea that Luke should play with the OT wording is rendered more plausible by the fact that he does so

⁽³⁵⁾ BRODIE, "The Accusing and Stoning of Naboth", 423-427.

elsewhere⁽³⁶⁾, and Fitzmyer seems to suggest the possible presence of a form of word-play when he says that the Greek word for "set" ("he set his face", 9,51) seems to be "a takeoff" on a Hebrew word⁽³⁷⁾. However, until the entire phenomenon of word-play is studied more closely, it seems difficult to judge such details.

What is certain in any case is that these are similarities which are substantial and unique.

5. *The journey from one place to another (2 Kgs 2,2-6; Luke 9,56)*

In highly repetitive language the OT text tells of the journey of Elijah and Elisha — first to Bethel, then to Jericho, and finally to the Jordan. The whole purpose, of course, is to go to Elijah's place of destiny.

In the NT the text simply says that Jesus and those with him went to another village — a journey that carries him also further along the path that will eventually lead to Jericho, to Bethphage and Bethany, and to his place of destiny, Jerusalem (cf. 9,57; 10,1; 18,35; 19,1.28-29).

That there is some similarity between the two journeys is clear — if for no other reason than that, passing through Jericho, they both travel, stage by stage, to meet their fate⁽³⁸⁾. But for Luke, it is too soon, in 9,51-56, to speak of Jericho. In view of the fact that he will inject into his narrative an extended travel account he holds over the reference to Jericho, and instead of saying that Jesus and his company went from one specific place to another, he simply says, in a general way, that they went to another village.

Thus once again he has both abbreviated the repetitiveness of the OT text and has adapted it to suit the long-term shape of his own narrative⁽³⁹⁾.

Despite the drastic abbreviation there is some linguistic similarity: in both texts the final brief phrases begin with "And they journeyed...", *kai eporeuthēsan*. The two Greek words constitute an expression which, though fairly common in the OT, does not otherwise occur in the NT⁽⁴⁰⁾.

⁽³⁶⁾ See esp. his reworking of certain sections of 2 Kings 4 and 5 (BRODIE, "Luke 7,36-50 as an Internalization of 2 Kings 4,1-37", 473, 475; "2 Kings 5 as One Component of Acts 8,9-40", 50, 61.

⁽³⁷⁾ *Luke I-IX*, 828.

⁽³⁸⁾ The dependence of Luke 9,56 on 2 Kgs 2,2-6 was first pointed out by Jerome Walsh in a discussion which followed the presentation of this article as a research report at the 1986 CBA meeting in Washington, D. C.

⁽³⁹⁾ In the opinion of Walsh (see previous note) the OT emphasis on being quiet about the impending taking away of Elijah (cf. 2 Kgs 2,3,5) has been a contributory factor to the way Luke avoids explicitness about the impending death of Jesus.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ It does, however, occur in the interpolated story of the adulteress (cf. John 7,53).

V. Summary of the Similarities, Differences and Adaptations

The texts have been broken into five segments or groupings:

- (1) The plan(s) of death and assumption (2 Kgs 1,1-2a.4.6b.15-17; 2,1; Luke 9,51).
- (2) The sending of the messengers (2 Kgs 1,2b; Luke 9,52).
- (3) The turning back of the mission (2 Kgs 1,3.5-6a; Luke 9,53).
- (4) The question of calling down fire (2 Kgs 1,7-14; Luke 9,54-55).
- (5) The journeying from one place to another (2 Kgs 2,2-6; Luke 9,56).

Such similarities are striking, particularly when they occur in essentially the same order. What is doubly striking, however, is that three of the five segments, numbers (1), (2) and (4), contain elements that are unique in the entire Bible. Nowhere else save in these passages does one find a picture of someone setting off for assumption, a combining of "and he sent messengers" with *poreuomai*, and an image of calling down fire from heaven. And as well as these unique similarities there are other significant similarities of detail, some of them intriguing.

The differences are great. In comparison with Luke, the OT text is long and repetitive. Furthermore it involves not just one main character but two, King Ahaziah and Elijah. And it sets the image of departing for assumption not at the beginning of the death-related episode, but after its conclusion.

However, though the differences are indeed great, they are not jumbled or incoherent, at odds with one another and with all known literary procedures. On the contrary, they correspond to steady patterns of adaptation — of modernization, abbreviation, fusion and emulation — patterns which are common both in imitation generally and in other instances where Luke imitates the OT. Since these differences may be explained through the procedures of imitation they may not be invoked to prove that imitation was not used.

VI. Conclusion

In attempting to account for the data, for the complex range of similarities and dissimilarities, the simplest hypothesis is that Luke, being a first century *littérateur*, employed a well-known literary procedure of the first century — he imitated part of the OT account of Elijah. He used basic techniques of adaptation, and he sought, above all, to emulate the older text. In other words, he sought to produce a better account and to show that the Jesus of whom he spoke surpassed the OT figure of Elijah.

One could of course say that it was Jesus himself who first sought to surpass Elijah. That there was some such tradition is possible and even likely⁽⁴¹⁾, but the way in which Luke has sought to express that tradition appears to be literary — through the careful synthesizing and surpassing of the Elijah

⁽⁴¹⁾ See esp. H. FLENDER, *St. Luke Theologian of Redemptive History* (Philadelphia 1967) 33-34.

narrative. In fact it is the literary explanation, and the literary explanation alone, which is capable of doing justice to the data — to the fact that many of the similarities are so unique or subtle, and to the fact that the differences, great though they are, have a certain coherence. Hence the tradition about Jesus, whatever it was, seems to have been combined with a deliberate literary procedure.

As well as integrating a basic tradition about Jesus, Luke has also integrated certain other elements of history and tradition. Thus he refers, for instance, to James and John, and to the Samaritans' antipathy towards Jerusalem.

It is scarcely possible, however, clearly to distinguish what is historical and what is not. It seems better, rather, to say of Luke 9,51-56 what Fitzmyer said of Luke 1-2, that whatever history it reflects "has been assimilated... to other literary accounts" (42).

The OT text, therefore, emerges not as a complete explanation of Luke's departure account but as one of its basic components. It does not provide an explanation for certain traditional or historical elements, nor for Luke's distinctive shaping of the material. But it does provide a framework, a literary skeleton as it were, and it is on the basis of that framework that Luke has built up the narrative.

To the extent that the OT text accounts for Luke's narrative, the hypothesis of a lost "L" source is less necessary — at least as far as Luke 9,51-56 is concerned. Also less necessary is the hypothesis of a lost Hebrew fragment. As so often with alleged semitisms in Luke-Acts, the data may be accounted for as Septuagintisms (43). Nor is it necessary to envisage Luke as creating the text freely. If his care in synthesizing 2 Kgs 1,1-2,6 is any guide, he seems to have exercised his creativity with immense discipline and fidelity.

3642 Lindell Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63108
U.S.A.

Thomas L. BRODIE

(42) Ibid., 309.

(43) See esp. FITZMYER, *Luke I-IX*, 113-125; E. RICHARD, "The Old Testament on Acts: Wilcox's Semitisms in Retrospect", *CBQ* 42 (1980) 330-341.

The "Mind of Christ" in 1 Corinthians 2,16

1 Cor 2,16 reads: "For who has known the mind of the Lord, so as to give counsel to him? But we have the mind of Christ". This short verse combines a citation of Isa 40,13 with an explanatory comment by Paul. The verse itself concludes a section, 2,6-16, which is set off from what precedes and follows it by a change from the first person singular (2,1-4; 3,1-6). Although this pericope has received a great deal of scholarly attention, this is not true of the concluding verse, upon which the present study focuses, and which appears to be a decisive point in the pericope.

The most extensive modern study of the pericope is found in the 1959 dissertation of Ulrich Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit*(¹), which includes an exhaustive collection of the *religionsgeschichtliche* materials which he uses to support his view that in 1 Cor 1-4 Paul undertakes to trump claims of certain gnostic Corinthians by using many of their own terms and ideas against them. However, unfortunately in Wilckens' view, Paul overreached safety and came dangerously close to adopting their gnostic soteriology and anthropology himself. In his stress on a gnostic background as decisive for interpreting 1 Cor 1-4 Wilckens is in a long line of interpreters going back through his teacher Bultmann, to Reitzenstein. Especially important for his argument are that: (1) Paul uses a technical vocabulary drawn from gnosticism (as he copiously illustrates from the later Gnostic sources) and (2) Paul equates Christ with Sophia under the model of the gnostic decensus myth of the Redeemed-Redeemer.

In the many reviews of Wilckens' work, the most common critique focuses upon his views of the nature of Gnosticism and its relationship to early Christianity(²). Indeed, most of the debate seems to be a quarrel over terminology, dating of sources, and the whole "gnostic problem". Similar approaches, also based on the "backgrounds" to 1 Cor 1-4, are found among various interpretations which argue that the proper background for 1 Cor 1-4

(¹) U. WILCKENS, *Weisheit und Torheit. Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu I. Kor 1 und 2*. (BHT 26; Tübingen 1959).

(²) Of the many reviews of Wilckens, see especially: H. KOESTER in *Gnomon* 33 (1961), 593-596; H. CONZELMANN, "Paulus und die Weisheit", *NTS* 12 (1965-66) 231-238; and R. W. FUNK, "Word and Word in 1 Corinthians 2:6-16", in his *Language, Hermeneutic and Word of God* (New York 1966) 275-305.

For a recent discussion of the difficulties in defining gnosticism, see H.-M. SCHENKE, "The Problem of Gnosis", *Second Century* 3 (1983) 73-88.

is the Pauline use of Jewish wisdom and/or apocalyptic speculations (Ellis, Scroggs, Pearson, Du Plessis, and Sellin)⁽³⁾.

The present study, however, does not seek to resolve the "*Hintergrund*" issue, but to approach the text from another angle. Too much of the debate, it seems to me, is more focused upon the background of the terms than the immediate usage in 1 Corinthians. For example, in Wilckens' 300+ page book, roughly half of which is explicitly devoted to "*der religionsgeschichtliche Hintergrund*", the verse here considered receives only one page of attention⁽⁴⁾. It seems to me that in the passage 2,6-16 the real concern of Paul is about the conduct, more than the reasonings, of the Christians in Corinth⁽⁵⁾.

Key Issues of Interpretation in 2,6-16

Many commentators have taken the phrase "mind of Christ" in 2,16 as a designation with which Paul acknowledges the existence of two levels of believers, and two types of Christian teaching⁽⁶⁾. There are "average" believers for whom kerygmatic preaching is appropriate, and there are "perfect/mature" Christians with the "mind of Christ" for whom Paul reserves a special wisdom (although he was unable to use it in Corinth). Some scholars argue that Paul's division of Christians into two classes, in imitation of gnostic practice, was inadvertent⁽⁷⁾, while others think it conscious⁽⁸⁾. Still others regard the two levels of believers as of little significance (since both the

(3) E. E. ELLIS, "'Wisdom' and 'Knowledge' in 1 Corinthians", *TynBul* (1973) 82-98; R. SCROGGS, "Paul: *SOPHOS* and *PNEUMATIKOS*", *NTS* 14 (1967-68) 33-55; B. PEARSON, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians* (SBLDS 12; Chico, CA 1973); G. SELLIN, "Das 'Geheimnis' der Weisheit und das Rätsel der 'Christuspartei' (zu 1 Kor 1-4)", *ZNW* 73 (1982) 69-96; P. J. DU PLESSIS, *TELEIOS: The Idea of Perfection in the New Testament* (Kampen 1959). The latter gives a good and brief survey of the terms in 2,6-16 used by Reitzenstein and older commentators to prove the influence of the mysteries on Paul's thought in these verses.

(4) Scroggs also, in his very thorough article, does not comment on the "mind of Christ" in the pericope.

(5) Also argued by FUNK, "Word and Word", 301, who observes that "Wilckens is pre-occupied with whether a particular word or sentence is to be referred to Jewish apocalyptic or gnostic conceptuality". He also calls attention, 277, note 4, to James Barr's now famous criticisms of focusing upon words alone in the interpretation of texts.

(6) H. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia 1975) 57, says: "The section is dominated by a pneumatic enthusiasm, a distinction between two classes of believer".

Conzelmann shares the "gnostic" background thesis, but other interpreters also think that Paul sanctions two levels of Christian teaching and two classes of believers, yet differ on the content of his higher theology. See Scroggs and Ellis, among others. It should be noted that Wilckens admits some influence of Jewish wisdom thought on Paul, which made him more willing to accept the similar theology from the Corinthian gnostics.

(7) So WILCKENS, *Weisheit*, 52, 53 and CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 59, 60.

(8) W. SCHMITHALS, *Gnosticism in Corinth* (Nashville 1965) esp. 138-140, 151.

mature and the immature have their salvation in the same sense and on the same basis), yet they think that Paul knows of two teachings: kerygma for all believers, and a deeper "wisdom" for a few⁽⁹⁾. The pervasiveness of this belief in a dichotomy either in teaching or classes of believers, requires that we begin by asking what evidence is set forth from 2,6-16 that Paul recognizes two categories of believers and two levels of acceptable Christian teaching?

Arguments for two levels of believers

1. *Teleioi*. One of the first terms to receive attention in the *religionsgeschichtliche* approach was *teleioi* ("perfect" or "mature"). Reitzenstein sought with it to prove an esoteric Pauline teaching offered only to a select few, as was done among the Hellenistic "mysteries"⁽¹⁰⁾. However, since Reitzenstein, this particular linguistic derivation has been largely replaced with emphasis upon the gnostic backgrounds.

Who, then, are the *teleioi* of 2,6 and how are they related to other Christians? Is it the case that here Paul is referring to a "higher class of believers"⁽¹¹⁾? This is what Wilckens argues in saying that Paul has taken over the term from Corinthian gnostics⁽¹²⁾. He, and others who also share this "gnostic" emphasis, see the *teleioi* as a qualitatively different class of Christian—the "perfect".

However, many other interpreters understand the word *teleioi* simply from the contrast with *nēpioi* ("babes", 3,1) and therefore render the word "mature". They argue that the *teleioi* are different from other Christians only by degree of maturity, not by a rigid stratification. They are distinguished from other believers by their greater reception of the divine grace⁽¹³⁾.

⁽⁹⁾ H.-D. WENDLAND, *Die Briefe an die Korinther* (NTD 7; Göttingen 1936) 27. Similarly, C. K. BARRETT, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (New York 1968) 68. E. KÄSEMANN, "I Kor 2:6-16", in his *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnung*, I (Göttingen 1960) 268, makes the equation of *sophia* and theology in this section of 1 Corinthians.

⁽¹⁰⁾ R. REITZENSTEIN, *Hellenistic Mystery Religions* (Pittsburg Theological Monographs, 15; Pittsburg 1978) 358. See also: W. BOUSSET, *Kyrios Christos* (Nashville 1970) 174. A good summary of the evidence collected by Reitzenstein is given in J. WEISS, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (KEK 5; Göttingen 1910) 72-74, although Weiss himself doesn't think there was direct influence on Paul's language from the mysteries. (He gives reasons to doubt this influence, 53, 54.)

⁽¹¹⁾ CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 68, suggests that the term is shaped by the philosophical tradition. "The *teleios* is the man of perfect wisdom". See also DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, 78, 79, and Kümmel in the appendix to H. LIETZMANN, *An die Korinther I. II* (HNT 9; Tübingen 1969) 170.

⁽¹²⁾ WILCKENS, *Weisheit*, 52-60.

⁽¹³⁾ A. ROBERTSON-A. PLUMMER, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh 1911) 36; BARRETT, *Corinthians*, 69; J. HÉRING, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (London 1962) 16. SCROGGS, "Paul", 47, also resists equating the *teleioi* with the *pneumatikoi*.

Yet finally even this more moderate interpretation, despite its seemingly reasonable recognition of differences in faith perception among believers, is probably mistaken. Such a distinction of two groups within the church is not indicated by the term *teleioi*. Du Plessis, rightly I think, has observed that the word *teleioi* is a general Pauline term for all Christians—just as are *hagioi*, *agapētoi*, *eklēktoi*, *klētoi*, and *pistoi* ("saints", "beloved", "elect", "called", and "faithful"). "Election, for instance, could not be a matter of degree. One is or one is not elected or called, or perfect, and one believes or believes not" (14). Thus the designation *teleioi* is not a convincing proof that Paul accepts two strata of Christians—pass/fail and honors.

2. *Pneumatikoi*, *psychikoi* and *sarkinoi*. The second-century Gnostics used these terms to describe their belief in three divisions of humanity (15). Because these terms are also used in the Corinthian letter, many interpreters have taken them as evidence that Paul accepted gnostic anthropology, or at least a similar division of humanity into stratifications.

The *pneumatikoi* ("spiritual") are often taken to be a higher level of Christian, equated with the *teleioi* (16). A major difficulty with such a superior class of believer is that elsewhere Paul assumes that all Christians have the Spirit (i.e., are *pneumatikoi*, cf. 1 Cor 3,16; 6,11.19; 12,13; cf. Gal 6,1; Rom 8,9, et al.). Thus it would be necessary to prove that in 1 Cor 2,12–3,4 some Christians are *pneumatikoi* in a special, more restricted sense (17).

The *pneumatikoi* in 2,12ff., are really defined by their contrast with the *psychikoi* ("psychic") and *sarkinoi* ("fleshly") (18). However, a Pauline use of

(14) DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, 205. "They [all believers] are perfect because they receive the full donation of the redemptive work of Jesus Christ".

(15) Examples of Gnostic usage of 1 Cor 2,13–15 are found in Hippolytus, *Ref. Haer.* 5.8.26; 6.34.7; 7.25.7 and in Irenaeus, *Haer.* 1.8.3.

M. F. WILES, *The Divine Apostle* (Cambridge 1967) 29, 30, notes that the fathers also made use of these types of divisions among Christians, but they stressed that a person was not fixed into a class (as Gnostics taught) but had a potential for growth.

(16) WEISS, *Korintherbrief*, 73, says that the *pneumatikoi* (or *teleioi*) are those Christians in whom the Spirit has really become the fundamental power of life. Many other interpreters also equate these two words: ROBERTSON-PLUMMER, *Corinthians*, 36; DU PLESSIS, *Teleios*, 179–185; FUNK, "Word and Word", 289, and BARRETT, *Corinthians*, 79. SELLIN, "Geheimnis", 82, argues that the terms *teleioi* and *pneumatikoi* originated with an Apollos-faction in Corinth as self-designations. But, he thinks, Paul applied them polemically to argue that: "Der wahre *logos sophias* ist nun der *logos tou staurou*... Weil ihr [the Apollos faction] den *logos tou staurou* nicht als die Weisheit erkennt, seid ihr auch jetzt noch keine *teleioi*".

(17) This difficulty is noted by CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 68, n. 122, who says that strictly speaking to be a Christian and to be a "physical" man are mutually exclusive. Yet Paul can speak thus of those who "are not giving realization to what from God's standpoint they are".

Similarly, KÄSEMANN, "I Kor 2:6–16", 269, notes that in 3,1 Paul says that he cannot speak to the Corinthians as *pneumatikoi*, yet he must not mean an absence of the Spirit, since if they lacked the Spirit they are not Christians.

(18) HÉRING, *Corinthians*, 22; CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 71; ROBERTSON-PLUMMER, *Corinthians*, 54. P. JEWETT, *Paul's Anthropological Terms* (AGJU 10; Leiden 1971) 123, thinks that the use of the term *sarkinoi* is to be credited

these terms to describe a sub-group of Christians is hard to accept at face value. Would he genuinely term those in whom the Spirit of God dwells (3,16; 6,19) *psychikoi*? And if it is difficult to accept that Paul can objectively call any believers *psychikoi*, it is even more so that he would call them *sarkinoi*. However, these two terms are clearly synonymous in 3,1-3 (although not in later gnosticism)⁽¹⁹⁾. If the *pneumatikoi* are elite, superior Christians, then the contrasting terms would have to be understood as "average" Christians, which seems to make too great a distinction from other Pauline usages.

How can we reconcile such appellations for any Christians with those given by Paul in 1 Cor 1,7; 3,16; 6,19? It seems to me that these terms cannot be taken at face value as anthropological divisions, but must be understood as satire⁽²⁰⁾.

One may summarize on the intent of these terms, often alleged to prove two levels of believers in 1 Cor 2,6-3,3. (1) These words are characteristic of, and almost exclusive to, the Corinthian letters. (2) It makes best sense to regard their appearance in the present passage (whatever their origin) as due to the Corinthian context itself. (3) These words have as their function a polemical puncturing of the elitest Corinthians' self-estimation⁽²¹⁾. (4) Therefore, it is best to see in these anthropological terms only Paul's means of correcting the Corinthians' self-importance. They are not real evidence that Paul himself acknowledges two grades of Christians.

Arguments for two types of Christian teaching

Just as some have found evidence in 1 Cor 1-4 for two classes of believers, some also have found proof of two different levels of Christian teaching: one given by Paul to all believers, and another which he reserved for a very select group of Christians. There are basically two terms found in the passage which are alleged to prove such a two-level teaching.

1. *Sophia Theou*. The popularity of the word *sophia* ("wisdom") in Gnostic Christianity, and its close association with the word *gnosis* ("knowledge") in that context, has led many to think that *sophia* in 2,6ff has a positive "gnostic" nuance.

The fundamental issue is whether the *sophia Theou* which Paul mentions in 2,6.7 is to be identified with the word of the cross which he develops in chapter one (esp. 1,23f.). Or, if the *sophia* in chapter 2 is different from the

directly to Paul, whereas his Corinthian opponents used *psyche* as the antonym for *pneuma*.

⁽¹⁹⁾ PEARSON, *Terminology*, 5; JEWETT, *Terms*, 121.

⁽²⁰⁾ This is not a new observation with me, however it seems not to have received the attention I believe it merits. Funk makes much of irony in interpreting 1 Cor 1-4, and I agree with his observations generally, without thereby sharing his philosophical concerns about the nature of speech.

⁽²¹⁾ As JEWETT, *Terms*, 188, says: "Paul's intention in introducing the 'Spiritual man' concept was polemical and therefore limited in its implications".

word of the cross, what is its content, and how does it relate to the word of the cross?

Those scholars who regard the *sophia Theou* in 2,6.7 as different from the word of the cross, which is the wisdom of God in 1,24, describe its content in differing ways. Wilckens believes that Paul has simply taken over the term from the Corinthian gnostics and uses it here in a way very inconsistent with his usage in 1,18–2,5⁽²²⁾. Others see Paul's positive use of *sophia* here as evidence of an enthusiastic Pauline pneumatism⁽²³⁾. Still others think this *sophia* is derived from Jewish apocalyptic and/or wisdom speculations, or Hellenistic-Jewish philosophy such as is found in Philo (Scroggs, Ellis, and Sellin, for example).

A difficulty for such an evaluation, however, is that in 1,10–2,5 Paul has just discussed *sophia* very critically by placing it in sharp contrast to the "word of the cross"⁽²⁴⁾. Moreover, since in Paul *sophia* is virtually restricted to the Corinthian letters, it seems most probable that there is a special relationship between his use of *sophia* in this pericope and the peculiar concerns of the Corinthian church which he addresses⁽²⁵⁾.

2. *En mystērīō*. One of the philological evidences often alleged to prove a Pauline esoteric teaching is the expression *sophian en mystērīō* ("wisdom in a mystery"). Does Paul by this expression speak of a "mysterious wisdom"? That is the position taken by both Wilckens and Scroggs, although they deeply disagree about the source of the term in Paul, and its content in his theology⁽²⁶⁾.

A check of other Pauline uses of *mystērīō* reveals that in some places he uses the word to refer to the plan of God for the salvation of the nations (Rom 11,25) and especially the final outworking of that plan (1 Cor 15,51)⁽²⁷⁾.

⁽²²⁾ U. WILCKENS, "Sophia", *TDNT* 7, 522. Here he repeats his contention that Paul's language is (mis)shapen by conflict with the gnostic Corinthians. It is unclear what content he assigns to Paul's concept of *sophia* in 2,6–16, although in note 382 he explicitly rejects taking it to mean God's plan of salvation.

Similarly, KÄSEMANN "I Kor 2:6–16", 267, 268, thinks that the word is taken from the gnostic vocabulary, but he does not think that this source is decisive for Paul's own meaning. Rather, he thinks that Paul uses Gnostic terminology to depict his teaching of justification by faith in a Hellenistic orientation.

⁽²³⁾ CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 71. Like Schmithals, he emphasizes that Paul was compelled to assert his own wisdom, so as not to be dealt out in his controversy with the Corinthian wise.

⁽²⁴⁾ R. BULTMANN, reviewing Karl Barth's "The Resurrection of the Dead", in *Faith and Understanding*, I (London 1969) 71,72, notes this and thus argues that the meaning of *sophia* in 2,6–16 cannot be the same as in 1,10–2,5, since in 2,6–16 it is a word *about* God, *about* man and *about* the cross.

⁽²⁵⁾ This word is found only three times in Paul outside 1 Cor 1 and 2: 1 Cor 12,8; 2 Cor 1,12 and Rom 11,33 (in a citation of a possible pre-Pauline text).

⁽²⁶⁾ WILCKENS, *Weisheit*, 64, 65; SCROGGS, "Paul", 44, 45, 54.

⁽²⁷⁾ J. MUNCK, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (Atlanta 1959) 155, 156, stresses the salvation-history content of the word in this passage. He also refers to Col 1,26 and Eph 3,49. See also ROBERTSON-PLUMMER, *Corinthians*, 37 and BARRETT, *Corinthians*, 70, 71.

There is a textual problem in Rom 16,25, as well as the larger suspicion that

On the other hand, in 1 Cor 14,2, and perhaps in 13,2, *mystērion* seems to refer to esoteric glossolalia. Thus the evidence to interpret *mystērion* based upon the other Pauline usage is mixed.

There are, indeed, some reasons for thinking that Paul might have had need to speak in 1 Corinthians of a special wisdom which he had in a positive manner. First, there would seem to be a polemical necessity for Paul to claim that he too has a special "wisdom" when correcting the Corinthian "wise". Second, in addition to the terms *sophia* and *mystērion* there seem to be other words (just discussed) which are congenial to an esotericism. Third, in 3,1 Paul says that he has not proclaimed his "wisdom" to the Corinthians, yet in 1,18 and 15,1-5 he recalls that he had proclaimed the word of the cross to them⁽²⁸⁾. Therefore, the argument runs, Paul's "wisdom in a mystery" must differ from his message of the cross.

Thus with differing views of its content, there is a common suspicion that Paul knew a higher wisdom—although he did not teach it at Corinth—"a superior stage of Christian teaching, a kind of Christian theosophy"⁽²⁹⁾. Most scholars who accept this view, insist that nonetheless, this special wisdom did not contradict the word of the cross (as did gnostic wisdom)⁽³⁰⁾.

A crucial evidence hinges on a problem of textual reading in 1 Cor 2,1—whether to read *mystērion* or *to martyron* ("the testimony") *tou Theou*⁽³¹⁾. The textual evidence itself is fairly evenly divided, and it is hard to determine the most likely reading⁽³²⁾. Moreover, since the immediate context has both expressions (in 1,6 and 2,7) copyist error could go either way.

However, if the reading accepted by the latest Nestle text is followed, then Paul in 2,1 equates *mystērion* with the preaching of the word of the cross, the kerygma (2,4), and uses it in contrast to the *sophia anthrōpōn* (2,5 "human wisdom"). In the context, then, the mystery is "Christ Jesus and him crucified" (2,2). This reading seems to make the best sense in 2,1-5 for

the whole chapter is non-Pauline. But if the verse is Pauline (from whatever writing) then it explicitly equates the "mystery of God" with the kerygma.

⁽²⁸⁾ BULTMANN, *Faith and Understanding*, 71-72, comments on the similarity of Paul's language to the mystery cults, and notes that Paul had preached the cross in Corinth. "Here, therefore, wisdom is not the word of the cross (*ho logos tou staurou*) in the sense of 1:18 ff. for that word is henceforth revealed". Similarly, WEISS, *Korintherbrief*, 53.

⁽²⁹⁾ HÉRING, *Corinthians*, 15. "It is no longer the pure and simple teaching of the cross which is meant, but a more profound mystery". He thinks that it is the teaching about the "powers" in vv. 6-10, where Paul "lifts the veil" (18).

⁽³⁰⁾ For example, BARRETT, *Corinthians*, 81, says: "Essentially it differs in form rather than content, as meat and milk are both food, though differently constituted". SCROGGS, "Paul", 35, says that Paul's wisdom teaching is "entirely separate from his kerygma". (Scroggs believes that it comes from Jewish apocalyptic.) SELLIN, "Geheimnis", 80f., who also thinks that Paul's wisdom derives from apocalyptic thought, believes that the wisdom is the same as the word of the cross, but understood on a different, theological plane.

⁽³¹⁾ The 26th edition of the Nestle text adopts the reading *to mystērion*, a change from the 25th edition, which read *to martyron*. *Mystērion* is also the reading of the UBS text.

⁽³²⁾ CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 53, n. 6 and FUNK, "Word and Word", 295.

the contrast is clearly between the wisdom of the world and the word of the Cross. But this means that Paul *did* speak his *mysterion* during his initial mission in Corinth, and that it was the kerygma itself, not an arcane word for the elite⁽³³⁾.

Thus since there seems to be no indication elsewhere in Paul's letters that he knows a different message from the word of the cross, it is worth closer examination of 2,6-16 to see how the picture painted here using this dualistic vocabulary actually functions in the context of 1 Corinthians. It is not incidental, I think, that many interpretations of 2,6-16 which stress a bi-level of Christian believers and/or teachings tend to minimize, even deny, any relationship of this pericope to its context.

The "Mind of Christ" in 1 Cor 2,16

After a review of important issues raised by the intriguing vocabulary in the immediate context of the phrase "the mind of Christ", I wish now to turn to the last verse itself, which completes the argument of 2,6-16.

Those exegetes who have focused upon individual terms, especially words familiar from later gnostic vocabulary, have most often equated the *nous* ("mind") in 2,16 with the gnostic *pneuma* ("spirit")⁽³⁴⁾. Thus the mind of Christ is the spirit of God/Christ and it is through the principle of "by like-like" that the pneumatic Christian is enabled to receive the mind of Christ and to rise above mere common believers⁽³⁵⁾. These scholars have argued that in 2,16 Paul speaks only of a select few who have the mind of Christ. It is either Paul himself⁽³⁶⁾, or the "spiritually endowed" Christian⁽³⁷⁾. It seems to me that often neglected in such interpretations of *nous* is what is really decisive for Paul's intent, i.e., his qualification, *Christou* ("of Christ"). Clearly this qualification is important for Paul since he alters the Old Testament quote by replacing *kuriou* ("Lord", which in the LXX meant YHWH, and in the present context would have been ambiguous). It is a deliberate change, as is clear from Rom 11,34, where Paul uses the same quote but retains the LXX reading, *kuriou*, without qualifying it⁽³⁸⁾.

⁽³³⁾ FUNK, "Word and Word", 295, rightly in my opinion, says that what was unrecognized by the "powers" was not the Redeemer hidden in his fleshly garb, but that he was openly and historically manifested in obedience and weakness. "To the Gnostic the foolishness and weakness of the Redeemer must be ephemeral; to Paul they are the substance of his redemptive word".

⁽³⁴⁾ REITZENSTEIN, *Religions*, 431, followed by WEISS, *Korintherbrief*, 68, and Wilckens. Also CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 69; JEWETT, *Terms*, 377 and BEHM, "*Nous*", *TDNT* 4, 958,9.

⁽³⁵⁾ WENDLAND, *Korinther*, 31; CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 65.

⁽³⁶⁾ PEARSON, *Terminology*, 110, note 75. Also SCROGGS, "Paul", 50, 54.

⁽³⁷⁾ MUNCK, *Paul*, 157, and WEISS, *Korintherbrief*, 69, who gives a rather romantic description of the experience of the pneumatic.

⁽³⁸⁾ JEWETT, *Terms*, 377, ascribes the quotation to Paul, not the Gnostics. (Against G. FEE, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [NICNT; Grand Rapids 1987] 119, n. 87, who argues there is no significance in this change.) WEISS, *Korintherbrief*, 68, 69, also indicates that the change of the LXX was purposive,

In the immediate context, what does Paul say about "Christ" to the Corinthians? In 2,2, he states his own intention to know nothing when preaching in Corinth, except "Jesus Christ and him crucified". Thus he preached "Christ crucified" (1,17.23), which is what the Corinthians believed (1,2; cf. 15,3). In Paul's view to have done otherwise would have emptied the cross (1,17) of its divine power and wisdom⁽³⁹⁾.

In addition to the usage of "Christ" in the immediate context, there are other reasons to doubt the frequent equation of "the mind of Christ" with mystic or pneumatic ecstasy as did Reitzenstein and Weiss (and others since). For elsewhere in this letter Paul contrasts "spiritual" prayer and song, which does have the *nous* engaged, with pneumatic ecstasy (1 Cor 14,14-19). For Paul the mind of Christ is related to sobriety, watchfulness, faith, hope and love, not to ecstasy.

Rather than regarding *nous* in Paul as equivalent either to a secret knowledge or a pneumatic capacity, I think that Jewett is right (at least for 2,16) in understanding *nous* as "the constellation of thoughts and assumptions which make up the consciousness of the person and act as the agent of rational discernment and communication"⁽⁴⁰⁾. This interpretation of *nous* is confirmed in Rom 12,2. There Paul, on the basis of Christ's saving work (chs. 1-11), appeals to the Roman Christians to have their minds made new. This he defines negatively as "not being conformed to this age" (note the parallel to 1 Cor 2,7.8) and positively as discerning God's will; namely *to agathon kai euareston kai teleion* "the good and acceptable and perfect" (again, note the verbal similarity to *teleiois* in 1 Cor 2,6). If this understanding of *nous* as the thoughts and assumptions which make up a person's consciousness is accepted, it means that the "mind of Christ" in 2,16 refers to believers having their outlook shaped by an awareness of Christ. He is the norm for the consciousness or "outlook" of the Christian community.

Paul had begun his appeal for unity among the Corinthian Christians by enjoining them to be "of the same mind" and to "speak the same thing" (1,10, which does not mean that they vocalize the same dogmas, but that they be in accord as believers, see Rom 15,5)⁽⁴¹⁾. If this were done then the result would be (as Paul wished) no divisions within the community. This is why he begins his appeal for Corinthian unity in chapter one based on "the name of our Lord Jesus Christ".

The expression *to auto phronein*, ("to think the same thing") is frequently used elsewhere by Paul in paranetic contexts, especially to urge mutual forbearance and selflessness modeled upon Christ's selflessness (see Rom 12,16; 15,5ff; 2 Cor 13,11; Phil 2,2-5 and 4,2). For Christians to "have the same mind" then refers to having the mutual interests of the community in

but he understands the content of the mind of Christ as having the "personality" of Christ.

⁽³⁹⁾ 1 Thess 5,12.14; 2 Thess 2,2, noted by JEWETT, *Terms*, 369-373. Jewett also, 377, thinks that *nous* here is anti-enthusiastic.

⁽⁴⁰⁾ Ibid., 450. Jewett depends here upon A. Schlatter who derives his understanding from his many studies of Josephus.

⁽⁴¹⁾ FUNK, "Word and Word", 283, 284.

mind, rather than one's own interests. This is clearly seen in Phil 2, where the appeal to *auto phronēte* is followed by the Christ-hymn which stresses the Lord's obedient self-emptying and sacrificial death. Thus "according to Phil 2:5 the confession of Christ is the standard for the mind of the believers, whose fellowship is controlled by Christ"⁽⁴²⁾. Furnish's observation on this passage is apt, and has a wider applicability: "The apostle intended Christ's obedience to be paradigmatic for the believers". Therefore the point of using the Christ-hymn in this context is to point to Christ's obedience which is "regarded as the ultimate expression of humble concern for others (vv. 3,4)"⁽⁴³⁾. This Philippians passage gives an important clue to correctly understanding the meaning of "mind of Christ" in 1 Cor 2,16.

Based upon both other Pauline usage and the immediate context, then, the appeal to "have the mind of Christ" does not mean to think Christ's thoughts after him, nor to have ecstatic experiences, nor to knowing proper dogma. The "mind of Christ" is not focused upon special wisdom or experiences, but on community life.

This interpretation of 2,6-16 as a paranesis on church conduct is confirmed by what immediately follows it (3,1-4)⁽⁴⁴⁾. His various criticisms of the Corinthians in 2,13-3,2 Paul substantiates, not by pointing out their conceptual or mystical failures, but by critiquing their conduct. "Since" (*gar*) their Christian life is characterized by *zēlos kai eris* ("jealousy and strife")—that is, one says "*eimi Paulou*" ("I am of Paul"), and another says "*Egō Apollo*" ("I am of Apollos")—Paul says that it is very clear that the Corinthian Christians are "merely human".

This criticism of Corinthian conduct as unbefitting Christians has been noted by virtually all commentators. However, most often it is taken as an additional proof of their faulty doctrine⁽⁴⁵⁾. That is, the criticism of their

⁽⁴²⁾ BERTRAM, "Phren", *TDNT* 9.233. This phrase, especially as it is used in Philippians, is examined in connection with the Roman law of *societas* by J. P. SAMPLEY, *Pauline Partnership in Christ* (Philadelphia 1980) esp. 66-68.

⁽⁴³⁾ V. P. FURNISH, *Theology and Ethics in Paul* (Nashville 1968) 218.

⁽⁴⁴⁾ J. FRANCIS, "As Babies in Christ—Some Proposals Regarding 1 Corinthians 3.1-3", *JSNT* 7 (1980) 41-60, gives an exposition of these verses which is compatible with the emphasis in the present study. He concludes, 56, "... the issue at 3:1 ff. would seem to be not a gradation of teaching, nor even the gradation of teaching appropriate to different stages of experience, but of how true understanding of the gospel can be rooted in its intended purpose in the life and experience of the believer".

⁽⁴⁵⁾ PEARSON, *Terminology*, 111; CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 72. WENDLAND, *Korinther*, 32, says that this discussion of the Corinthians' quarrelsome conduct is a new tack after Paul's discussion of Corinthian gnosis (in 2,6-16).

MUNCK, *Paul*, 159, says: "The Corinthian deification of men and their boasting about certain teachers, are conclusive proof that they are still like people without faith and the Holy Spirit (3:1-4)".

HÉRING, *Corinthians*, 22, says: "These schisms, centered around human beings are the clearest sign of the unredeemed and purely human mentality of the members of the church".

BARRETT, *Corinthians*, 69, "By their behaviour the Corinthian Christians show themselves, in general, to be still infants; they are not mature, nor spiritual, and therefore are not ready for Christian wisdom".

conduct is one more way to refute their faulty Christology. But this interpretation places the *focus* of Paul's discussion on certain conceptual errors, rather than conduct, which seems to me to reverse Paul's priorities.

I believe, agreeing with Funk, that in the criticism of the Corinthians' *conduct* as not spiritual, but "merely human", we have the real pulse of the argument in the first four chapters. That is, the intent of the whole section is a criticism of the internal strife at Corinth, manifested in their boasting about their apostolic heroes⁽⁴⁶⁾. This concern to correct divisiveness is stated already in 1,10-17 when Paul asks that they "all speak the same thing" and that there "be no divisions among them". The same concern recurs in 4,6, which prompts Funk to ask rhetorically, "Is it not the case that dissension among the Corinthians is the occasion for the whole essay?"⁽⁴⁷⁾.

Summary and Conclusion: The "Mind of Christ" as Exhortation

Nils Dahl has rightly stressed the primary importance of focusing on "relatively clear and objective statements concerning the situation in Corinth" when interpreting 1 Cor 1-4. The next source is to use Paul's "evaluations, polemical and ironic allusions, warnings and exhortations"⁽⁴⁸⁾. (The difficulty, of course, is agreeing on which is which!) Using Dahl's proposed methodology, I wish in conclusion to assess whether the "mind of Christ" is properly understood as referring to two levels of believers and/or two levels of wisdom.

What is stated clearly is: (1) While evangelizing in Corinth Paul resolutely determined to know only the message of Jesus Christ and him crucified (2,2; cf. 1,17.18.23). (2) This message was believed and accepted with saving results by the Corinthians (15,1.2). (3) Paul begins the body of 1 Corinthians with a strong attack on intra-church divisiveness (see esp. 1,11-17) and concludes the first major section of the letter with a similar rebuke (4,1-13). In between he also argues against internal divisiveness and boasting (3,3.4.21). (4) This makes most unlikely that having opposed divisiveness on the basis of the *Corinthians'* wisdom, Paul would sponsor a similar division with *his*

Most striking is SCROGGS' comment, "Paul", 35, n. 3, "It is important to stress that the *content* [his italics] of Paul's wisdom is apocalyptic, not pragmatic or *ethical*" [my italics]. He does say, however, 38, "The *teleios* is here for Paul the *ethically* [my italics] and intellectually disciplined Christian, obedient to the kerygma, who is able to receive the *sophia* Paul can impart".

⁽⁴⁶⁾ Both Funk and W. BAIRD, "Among the Mature", *Int* 14 (1960) 425-432 make this point in their articles. However, their presentations have received little consideration in the subsequent discussion. Although I have not done a detailed search, a quick review of later studies has found Funk's article only cited twice (and only once really used on this point), and Baird's very useful article (from a somewhat different approach to the present study) is not even cited.

⁽⁴⁷⁾ FUNK, "Word and Word", 286. He answers, of course, that it is.

⁽⁴⁸⁾ N. DAHL, "Paul and the Church at Corinth according to 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21", *Christian History and Interpretation* (eds. W. R. FARMER, C. F. D. MOULE, and R. R. NIEBUHR) (Cambridge 1967) 317. Also in his *Studies in Paul* (Minneapolis 1977) 40-61.

own teaching⁽⁴⁹⁾. Would not this encourage the Pauline faction? It would seem most awkward in the midst of an argument against divisiveness that Paul would endorse any bi-level division of believers!

In view of these certainties it seems best to say that also in 2,6-16 Paul knows only of one message—the word of the cross, which is the *sophia theou* (thus, 1,24 = 2,6). The mind of Christ, then, is an ethical outlook formed around this message, which is manifest in the proper attitudes and conduct among believers. It is the appropriation and application in the church's life of the word of the cross (a concern prominent in 2 Corinthians, in Paul's debate with the super-apostles over the criteria of authentic apostleship. See, *inter alia*, 2 Cor 5,14-15).

This suggested interpretation requires some explanation of those statements which, at least on face value, appear to describe two levels of Christians (*teleioi*, *pneumatikoi* vs. *psychikoi*, *sarkinoi*, *nēpioi*) and/or two levels of Christian teaching (*sophia theou*, *mystērion*, *ta bathē tou theou* vs. *didaktōis anthrōpinēs*: *gala* vs. *brōma*). The best explanation for Paul's use of such terminology (not their origin), is to regard them as the same type of irony which is certainly found in 4,8-13, and probably in 8,10.11⁽⁵⁰⁾. The presence of irony in 2,6-3,4 is widely noted, but its importance for the interpretation of the function of 2,6-16 is too often not taken into full account. However, the importance of irony in the pericope has been rightly stressed by Funk, who says that in this entire section Paul is turning the Corinthians' self-perceptions inside out. "The irony in his language is patent"⁽⁵¹⁾. His reconstruction of the intent of the irony in the section is very good:

Paul cannot give them the 'mysteries' (which they thought they possessed) because they have been and are 'fleshly' (which they thought they were not) until they become 'spiritual' (which they believed themselves to be): when they become 'spiritual' they will see that the 'mysteries' are nothing other than the word of the cross, which is foolishness, and that the strife among them is the sign of this fleshliness (3:3)⁽⁵²⁾.

In conclusion, in 1 Cor 2,6-16 Paul does not distinguish between two messages nor between two classes of Christians at all. Rather the purpose of

⁽⁴⁹⁾ SCROGGS, "Paul", 38, n. 4, is sensitive to this difficulty, but insists that Paul actually accepts differing levels of maturity, spiritual gifts, intellectual levels and productivity among Christians. "What he attacks is rather *divisions* [his italics] based on a prideful evaluation of such distinctions". This might be theoretically possible, even necessary, but could/would Paul have indicated any approval of differing levels of Christians without that being taken in a divisive way?

⁽⁵⁰⁾ In spite of SCROGGS, "Paul", 38, who explicitly rejects ironic language here. Similar is BULTMANN, *Faith and Understanding*, 70. On ironic speech in 1 Corinthians, see my, *Idol Meat in Corinth* (SBLDS 68; Chico, CA 1985) esp. 71-77.

⁽⁵¹⁾ FUNK, "Word and Word", 303, says that Paul is "deforming" and "re-minting" the Corinthians' language. Also see FEE, *Corinthians*, 100.

⁽⁵²⁾ FUNK, "Word and Word", 300.

the pericope is a polemic against the quarrelsome conduct of the Corinthians. The immediate ethical problems of church division, not the linguistic backgrounds of the terminology, is decisive. Recognizing this intent it is not necessary to regard 2,6-16 as an aside, or a parenthesis⁽⁵³⁾. It is integral with the total purposes of 1 Cor 1-4 and advances Paul's exhortation to unity among believers, the major concern in this letter as a whole.

Southwest Missouri State Univ.
Springfield, MO 65804 U.S.A.

Wendell WILLIS

⁽⁵³⁾ As is held by WEISS, *Korintherbrief*, 52, 70. CONZELMANN, *1 Corinthians*, 63, says: "The passage is in contradiction to the context". Even Du Plessis is led to say that 1,18-2,16 deals with Christian vs non-Christian dichotomy and 3,1 ff. with intra-Christian dichotomy.

More radical is the view of W. WIDMANN, "1 Cor 2:6-16: Ein Einspruch gegen Paulus", *ZNW* 70 (1979) 44-53, who argues that the entire pericope is a gloss from the Corinthian enthusiasts to correct Paul's attack on wisdom!

All these attempts to detach 2,6-16 from any real function in the overall argument of 1-4 fail to take into adequate consideration the paranetic function of the pericope.

RECENSIONES

Vetus Testamentum

A. R. DIAMOND, *The Confessions of Jeremiah in Context. Scenes of Prophetic Drama* (JSOT Supplement Series 45). Sheffield, Academic Press, 1987. 308 p. 21 × 13,5. £ 19.50/\$ 29.50; £9.95/\$ 14.95.

Seit man vor mehr als einem Jahrhundert begonnen hat die sogenannten 'Konfessionen' Jeremias als etwas Eigenes zu betrachten, wuchs auch sprunghaft ihre Bedeutung für das Bild, das man sich vom Propheten und seinem Dienst machte. Im Grunde hat sich daran bis heute nicht viel geändert, obwohl man von Zeit zu Zeit wegen des psalmhaften Charakters der Texte gegen eine solche 'biographischpsychologische' Deutung Einspruch erhob. In diese Diskussion möchte die vorliegende Arbeit (— eine Dissertation von Cambridge/GB —) eingreifen, indem sie einerseits die Texte erneut in Auseinandersetzung mit der neueren Forschung einer gründlichen Analyse unterzieht (Part I), und andererseits die Frage stellt, welche Funktion die 'Konfessionen' in ihrem Kontext erfüllen, um damit zu erklären, warum die Texte überhaupt in das Buch aufgenommen wurden (Part II).

Im exegetischen Teil stellt man mit Freude fest, mit welcher Behutsamkeit Verf. die einzelnen methodischen Schritte durchzieht und vorschnelle Schlüsse meidet. Als 'Erweiterungen' werden z.B. nur 11,21-23; 15,13-14.15aα und 18,18 anerkannt, in der Formanalyse werden sowohl die Gemeinsamkeiten wie auch die Unterschiede zu den Klagepsalmen registriert und die Frage nach dem 'Sitz im Leben' bleibt weitgehend offen, auch wenn zum Teil deutliche Bezüge zu prophetischen Lebenssituationen feststellbar erscheinen, bzw. durch sekundäre Elemente (vgl. 11,21; 18,18) hergestellt werden.

Im Anschluss an den exegetischen Teil diskutiert Verf. die Frage, ob die Texte eine zusammenhängende Reihe bilden und als solche eine bestimmte Aussage vermitteln. Nach einer kritischen Durchsicht der bisherigen Antworten stellt er die These auf, dass nach Form und Inhalt zwei 'Zyklen' zu

unterscheiden sind. Der erste ist formal durch die Dialogform der Texte, inhaltlich durch sein Kreisen um den prophetischen Auftrag gekennzeichnet und umfasst die ersten fünf Texte. 17,14-18 hat eine Sonderstellung, weil er überleitet zum zweiten 'Zyklus', dessen Schwerpunkt die Auseinandersetzung mit den Gegnern bildet. Formales Merkmal ist hier, dass die Gegner direkt zu Wort kommen (17,15; 18,18; 18,20aα[?]; 20,10), während Antworten Gottes fehlen. Inhaltlich spiegelt 18 eine ähnliche Zuversicht wie 11. 20,7-13 klingt schliesslich aus mit der Hoffnung auf Errettung aus dem Konflikt und umgreift damit beide 'Zyklen'. 20,14-18 stellt jedoch ein Problem für dieses Konzept dar, dem Verf. vorerst im Sinne des Vorschlags von D. J. A. Clines – D. M. Gunn, "Form, Occasion and Redaction in Jeremiah 20", *ZAW* 88 (1976) 406f begegnen möchte. Soweit in groben Strichen die Ergebnisse des ersten Teiles, zu denen ein paar Bemerkungen gestattet seien.

Wenn Verf. 11,21-23 insgesamt als Prosa bestimmt und deshalb als Erweiterung ansieht, wird er weithin Zustimmung finden, aber man darf auch fragen, ob V. 21ff wirklich so einheitlich sind, wie D. meint (vgl. 25), oder ob man nicht besser mit einem Wachstum rechnet (wofür etwa G zu sprechen scheint). Ähnliches gilt für den Versuch, 12,6 als ursprünglich zu erweisen. Man kann zwar das Missverhalten des Vaterhauses mit V.1.2b parallelisieren (vgl. 43) und teilweise als Erklärung zu V.5 verstehen aber doch nur zu V.5a. Welche Funktion hat V. 5b? Gegenüber der chiasmischen Anordnung gewisser Wörter in V. 1-6 (vgl. ebd.) ist doch die Entsprechung der chiasmisch formulierten Fragen zu den ebenso chiasmischen Gegenfragen die gewichtigere Struktur. Was wäre sonst der Sinn von *zwei* Gegenfragen? Bei 15,10-14 ist hervorzuheben, dass Verf. auch V. 13-14 in der Form des MT (!) in die Analyse einbezieht; das ist ein Fortschritt. Über die Aussage dieser Verse und den Grund ihrer Einfügung wird freilich noch weitere Diskussion nötig sein, zumal eine solche in unserem Jahrhundert vielfach ausgefallen ist. Die Gottesantwort von 15,19-21 ist nach D. einem Heilsorakel nachgebildet und deshalb einheitlich. Unterstützend kommt hinzu, dass D. Jeremia wie in 12,1ff im Konflikt mit dem ganzen *Volk* sieht und nicht mit einer bestimmten Gruppe, so dass die Spannungen zwischen V. 19 und 20 aufgehoben erscheinen. Dagegen möchte man freilich fragen, ob unter diesem Blickwinkel noch V. 19b in seiner vollen Schärfe gesehen werden kann. Wenn es ohnehin nur den *Konflikt* geben kann (V. 20 – vgl. 78), dann ist *jšbw hmh 'lyk* unreal und daher überflüssig. Ganz anders verhält es sich aber, wenn es sich um einen bestimmten Kreis handelt, für den die Möglichkeit der 'Wende' tatsächlich bestünde. In 20,7-13 stimmt die Annahme, dass V. 7-9 abwechselnd vom Leiden unter Jahwe und unter den Gegnern berichtet (vgl. 104) nur, wenn der Ruf *hms wšd* gegen Gott gerichtet ist, was man mit guten Gründen bezweifeln kann. Nimmt man nämlich den Ruf als Inhalt der Botschaft, dann wird nicht nur der logische Zusammenhang in V. 7b-9 straffer, sondern man erkennt auch den bewusst gestalteten Gegensatz zwischen dem *dbr* JHWH, der *in* Jeremia ist, und der *dbh* der Gegner, wenn diese glauben, den Propheten mit einem Schlagwort seiner Verkündigung (= *mgwr msbjb*) noch betören zu können. Sieht man den Zusammenhang so, dann kann man auch *hgjdw wngjdnw* nicht mehr im 'traditionellen Sinn' interpretieren (vgl. 112).

Die vorgelegten Analysen der Texte werden in Kap. 2 aufgearbeitet zu einer Zusammenschau, wobei die Annahme von zwei 'Zyklen' die Grundthese bildet. Sieht man sich die Darstellung näher an, so ist ihr wohl in den grossen Linien zuzustimmen, aber es bleibt die Frage, ob man von zwei 'Zyklen' sprechen muss. Gewiss können 11,18–12,6 und 15,10–21 wegen ihrer Dialogform abgegrenzt werden, aber thematisch gehört 11,18–23 nicht zu jenen Texten, welche die Gottesproblematik entfalten, denn er führt nur die Feindproblematik ein, die später in 17 und 18 im Vordergrund steht. Auf der anderen Seite zeigt die Komposition in 11,18–12,6 sehr schön, wie sich die Gottesproblematik aus der Feindproblematik entwickelt, denn das angekündigte Gericht (11,21–23) provoziert angesichts der Zustände von 12,1–4 die Frage nach dem Eintreffen und hinter dieser steht wiederum das Problem der Bestätigung des Propheten. Letzteres ist als gemeinsamer Nenner aller Texte anzusprechen, wenn auch die Blickrichtung sich ändert. In 12 und 15 steht im Vordergrund, dass *Gott* scheinbar nichts zur Bestätigung des Propheten tut, des Propheten Not also von Gott, in 17; 18 und 20 aber von den *Gegnern* ausgeht, während der Prophet immer mehr die Entscheidung Gott anvertraut. Wenn also ein so markanter Umschwung stattfindet, so ist anzunehmen, dass die durch Gott ausgelöste anfängliche Verunsicherung in 15,19(–21) eine endgültige Antwort gefunden hat. Daher scheint die Annahme eines blossen "shift of attention to the conflict between prophet and nation" (144) zuwenig. Auch 20,7–13 erscheint unter dem Gesichtspunkt der Legitimation in einem anderen Licht, denn nun gründet die Sicherheit gegenüber den 'Verführern' nicht mehr auf dem äusseren Kriterium der Erfüllung, sondern vielmehr auf der inneren Gewissheit, ganz und unentrinnbar von Gott für einen 'verrückt' erscheinenden Dienst in Beschlag genommen zu sein. 20,9 ist daher der Endpunkt aller Legitimationsprobleme, da Jeremia ein neues und unerschütterliches Kriterium der Echtheit gefunden hat, das ihn gegenüber äusseren Anfechtungen immun macht. Deshalb fehlen hier die Bitten um Herbeiführung des Gerichts! Wenn dem so ist, dann ist 20,7–13 kaum als 'lament' zu bezeichnen. Schliesslich führt von der nun in *Jeremia* liegenden Gewissheit auch ein Weg zu einem Verständnis von 20,14–18, weil der Prophet sich erst aufgrund dieser Erkenntnis/Erfahrung selbst als Unheilsträger begreifen und den Tag seiner Geburt für verflucht erklären kann.

Schliesslich bleibt die Frage, wer den Zusammenhang der 'Konfessionen' geschaffen hat. Verf. verweist in seiner Antwort darauf, dass die Verbindung der Texte zu einem guten Teil von den redaktionellen Elementen ausgehe, so dass man "the interrelated complex as the result of the major final redaction in the book" (145) bezeichnen könne. Daran ist viel Richtiges, aber es ist auch nicht zu übersehen, dass schon die 'ursprünglichen' Texte in der Entfaltung des Themas konsequent aufeinander aufbauen und auch stilistisch aufeinander abgestimmt sind. Da aber dieser Zusammenhang nur auf einer *literarischen* Ebene erkennbar ist (und nicht in zeitlich auseinanderliegenden Verkündigungssituationen), scheint es angebracht, die wenig Erfolg versprechende Suche nach einem 'Sitz im Leben' dieser Texte aufzugeben und ihnen nur einen 'Sitz im Buch' zuzuschreiben – zumindest in der uns vorliegenden Form. Man wird die Texte vergleichen können mit dem Berufsbericht, der

in dieser Form auch nie einen 'Sitz' in der Verkündigung hatte, sondern für das Buch verfasst ist.

Im zweiten Teil des Buches zeichnet Verf. das Verhältnis der 'Konfessionen' zum Kontext nach. Die vielen wertvollen Einzelbeobachtungen können hier nicht referiert werden, wichtig ist das Ergebnis, dass die 'Konfessionen' innerhalb von 'stilisierten Szenen der Verkündigung' (— im Anschluss an W. Thiel, *Die deuteronomistische Redaktion von Jer 1–25* [Neukirchen 1973] 163 u.ö. —) verankert sind. Der Kontext erfüllt dabei hauptsächlich die Funktion, das Gericht Gottes über Juda/Jerusalem zu begründen. Diese Ergebnisse verbindet D. schliesslich mit seiner Darstellung des Zusammenhangs der 'Konfessionen' und kommt zu dem Schluss, dass die Annahme von zwei 'Zyklen' auch vom Kontext bestätigt wird. Sieht man jedoch das gemeinsame Moment der 'Konfessionen' in der Legitimationsproblematik, dann wird man im Kontext nicht bloss den Aufweis der Straffälligkeit des *Volkes* sehen können. Der Kontext nimmt auch Bezug auf die Gottesproblematik des Propheten, indem durch ihn gezeigt wird, wie auch Jeremia selbst vom Gerichtswillen Gottes überzeugt werden musste. Schliesslich ist es aufgrund der literarischen wie auch der sachlichen Zusammenhänge mit 19 und 20,1–6 ausgeschlossen, 21,1–10 nicht in den Kontext von 20,7–13.14–18 einzubeziehen, denn ohne dieses Wort aus der 'letzten Stunde' entbehrt nicht nur 19,1–20,6 des Abschlusses im Sinne einer Bestätigung, welche auch für 20,10f. gilt, sondern es bildet auch den weiteren Interpretationsrahmen für 20,14–18, da erst durch den Blick auf das Ende die Fluch und nicht Segen bedeutende Geburt Jeremias mit allen Konsequenzen deutlich wird.

Diese Bemerkungen sind nicht primär als Kritik an dieser ausgezeichneten Arbeit gemeint, sondern vielmehr als ein Beitrag zur Förderung des Gesprächs über diese so zentralen Texte für das Verständnis des Propheten und — wohl noch mehr — seines Buches.

Harrachstrasse 7
A-4020 Linz

Franz D. HUBMANN

B. RENAUD, *Michée – Sophonie – Nahum* (Sources Bibliques). Paris, J. Gabalda et Cie Editeurs, 1987. 329 p. 23 × 15,5. FF 375

Mehr als die Hälfte dieses Kommentars behandelt das Michabuch, bei dem das Anliegen des Verfassers (vgl. schon B. Renaud, *La Formation du livre de Michée. Tradition et actualisation* [EB; Paris 1977]), nicht nur die einzelnen Prophetenworte als solche zu untersuchen, sondern auch die spätere "relecture" des Grundwortes in ihrem je eigenen Kontext zu würdigen, naturgemäß mehr als bei Zefanja und Nahum zu seinem Recht kommt.

Einen michanischen Grundbestand nimmt R. nur im ersten Teil des Michabuches an, also in cap. 1–3, während er den Kern von 6,9–16 für zwar vorexilisch, aber nicht michanisch hält. Die Datierung bewegt sich für Michas

Worte zwischen 722 v. Chr. (1,3-7) und 701, nach Hiskias Revolte (1,8-16); cap. 3 jedenfalls nach 722. Es ist nicht verwunderlich, daß man im einzelnen z.T. anderer Meinung sein kann als der Verf. und vielleicht auch hie und da Fragezeichen setzen möchte, z.B. bei der selbstverständlichen Annahme des "droit fondé sur l'alliance" (p. 51), die vielleicht doch näher zu bestimmen wäre, und bei dem oft gebrauchten, nicht hinterfragten oder belegten Begriff des "peuple élu" (z.B. p. 69 u.ö.). Auch 7,1-4a.5-6 hält R. für vorexilisch, aber nicht von Micha stammend, sondern aus der letzten Zeit des Königtums. Daß die Ausdrücke *šar*, *šōfēt* und *gādōl* (als soz. Terminus) von 7,3 bei Micha selbst nicht vorkommen (p. 141), kann aber bei der schmalen Basis von sicher zuschreibbaren Worten kaum als Beweis gelten. Letzten Endes ist wohl die Entscheidung für oder gegen Michas Autorschaft bei den als vorexilisch eingeschätzten Stücken eine Gefühlssache, wenn man bedenkt, wie wenig historisch sicher Einzuordnendes wir von Micha wissen.

Gerade dieses Buch ist ein Paradebeispiel der Nachgeschichte oder "relecture". Eine erste Stufe der Auslegung sieht R. in der zweiten literarischen Schicht des Buches, der "*édition exilique*", die cap. 1-3 + 6,2-7,7 umfaßt und ein chiasmisch angeordnetes "Diptychon" (p. 166) darstellt. Der exilische Herausgeber "fait fonction d'interprète" und steht theologisch (vgl. den Hoffnungsschimmer in 7,7!) dem dtr. Geschichtswerk nahe. Dazu gehört auch die Überschrift 1,1, in der R. den "Ereignischarakter" (*caractère événementiel* p. 167) des Wortes Gottes ausgesprochen findet. Ob man allerdings wirklich von einer "personnalisation" des Wortes Gottes sprechen kann, das "kommt", hängt ganz und wohl zu sehr von der Einschätzung des Verbs *היה* (dazu jetzt ermüthend R. Bartelmus, *HYH. Bedeutung und Funktion eines hebräischen "Allerweltswortes"* [München 1982]) und der Präposition *אֶל* ab.

Die "*structuration définitive du livre*" (p. 169) durch 1,2; 6,1; cap. 4-5 (einschließlich 2,12-13) und 7,8-20 sieht R. als das Werk eines (wieso unbedingt nur eines?) Gläubigen, der das geistliche Erbe seines Volkes bearbeitete (p. 170). 4,1-4 hält R. für nachexilisch, da es den Tempelbau voraussetze, jedoch vor Joël 4,10 abgefaßt. Fragwürdig scheinen der Rez. die Assoziationen zum hinkenden Jakob in Pnuel, die R. an 4,6-7 knüpft (p. 83) und die gar bis zu der Behauptung gesteigert werden, "le patriarce" (wohlgemerkt in so verhüllter Anspielung) "incarner le peuple". Hier wie noch öfter stellt sich die Frage des Korrektivs zum metakritischen assoziativen Inbeziehungsetzen von Bibelstellen.

Auch in 5,6-7 findet R. Anspielungen an den Patriarchen, und zwar über den "Tau des Himmels", der ihn (p. 111) an Isaaks Segen für Jakob (Gn 27,27-29) erinnert — vielleicht doch ein zu spezieller Schluß aus einem eher allgemein sich anbietenden Bild. Auch ob in 5,4b-5a ein ursprünglich antiasyrisches Orakel von ca. 720 v. Chr. (p. 106) verarbeitet und mit dem Messiasorakel von 5,1.3 zusammengearbeitet wurde, um schließlich die jetzt vorliegende Einheit 5,1-5 aus der Zeit des Serubbabel zu bilden, scheint der Rez. fraglich. 5,4a bleibt grammatisch unklar; v.a. aber wirft die These, daß eine Vorform von 4,9-14 im Interesse der "structuration des chapitres 4 et 5" ihres Heilsausblicks beraubt worden wäre, Probleme der Überlieferungskonzeption auf, die noch einer Lösung harren. Wäre es nicht doch plausibler, daß

4,9-14 von vornherein auf 5,1ff zu geschrieben wären? Ob schließlich zur Datierung der Endgestalt von cap. 7 das Argument zu 7,11, hier sei Nehemias Mauerbau noch nicht vorausgesetzt, tragfähig ist, muß im Blick auf den metaphorischen Gebrauch von גִּיר (I. Willi-Plein, *Vorformen der Schriftexegese innerhalb des Alten Testaments* [BZAW 123; Berlin-New York 1971] 107f.) bezweifelt werden.

Trotz Skepsis im einzelnen — eine Schwachstelle bleibt auch die Umstellung von 2,12-13 zwischen 4,7 und 8 — ist jedenfalls die Gesamtdarstellung der "structuration définitive" bedenkenswert. Strukturierendes Hauptstichwort wäre demnach die Wurzel שָׁמַע in 1,2 (vorausweisend), 5,14 (Vorhergehendes und Folgendes verklammernd) und 6,1 (den Schlußteil einleitend); der alles bestimmende theologische Leitgedanke eine Eschatologisierung mit Zentrierung auf Jerusalem. Nach dieser Beschreibung legt sich dann die Datierung in nachexilische Zeit nahe.

Bei Zefanja scheinen die Dinge etwas einfacher zu werden. Praktisch alles, was nicht "relecture" ist, könnte von Zef selbst stammen und in die von R. für dessen Auftreten (hauptsächlich über die Skythenthese) anvisierte Zeit der Unmündigkeit des Josia gehören, also 1,7-18; 2,1-3; 2,4-6.8.9a.12.13f. (d.h. der Kern der Fremdvölkersprüche); 3,1-8 und 3,11-13. Diese zeitliche Nähe zu deuteronomisch geprägtem Schrifttum macht aber die Annahme dtr. Erweiterungen (1,4-6) letztlich zum Geschmacksurteil.

Jedenfalls ergibt sich in der Endfassung des Zef.-Buches als Gesamtstruktur das Schema A (göttliches "ich") — B (3. Pers. in bezug auf Gott) — A' (göttliches "ich"), aber in einer thematischen Zweiteilung in (p. 245) "jour de châtimement" und "jour de purification". Gerahmt wird das Ganze nach R. durch das Stichwort אָסַף in 1,2 und 3,18, wobei aber dessen Bedeutung als "Sammlung" (rassembler) lediglich relecture für die ursprüngliche Bedeutung "retirer, enlever" sei. Eine ähnlich schwankende Bedeutung (und Form!) nimmt R. für den Ausdruck *šub šbū'it* in Zef 3,20 als Wiederaufnahme aus 2,7 (ebenfalls redaktionell) an. In bezug auf diese Wendung könnte die Bedeutungsschwankung dem Selbstverständnis der Überlieferung entsprechen (was vielleicht noch eingehenderer Untersuchung wert wäre), doch muß Rez. gestehen daß sie Zweifel an der Doppeldeutigkeit von *šub* "détourner" oder "revenir" und *g'ōn* "orgueil" oder "fierté" in Nah 2,3 (p. 297) hat, wenn die Bedeutungen mehr als Übersetzungsvarianten sein sollen.

Bei Nahum ist nach R.'s Ansicht immer — also nicht erst auf redaktioneller Ebene — nur Ninive die Adressatin der Unheilsprophetie, es hat also keine Übertragung von Jerusalem auf die Fremdmacht stattgefunden. Der auf den Propheten zurückgehende Kern läßt sich somit zwischen 630 (Tod Assurbanipals) und 612 (Fall Ninives) datieren, da die Worte gegen Ninive "un avenir proche" (p. 308) betreffen und jedenfalls echte Zukunftsankündigungen sind. Damit wird die Problematik der "Heilsprophetie" gelöst und zugleich verständlich, wieso die spätere Redaktion des Buches in der Stadt die eschatologische Feindin sah und sehen mußte, so daß in der relecture das ganze Buch zur "message d'espérance" (p. 323) wurde. Das leuchtet gerade auch im Blick auf die weitere Nachgeschichte in Qumran (4Qp Nah) und Offb. 18 ein.

Der Autor will einerseits Nahum selbst als "impressionistischem" Dichter (p. 266) gerechtwerden, andererseits auch dem gewichtigen Anteil, den der

nachexilische Redaktor an Komposition, Einheit und Gesamtstruktur des Buches hatte. Gegenüber Zuweisungen an spätere Hände übt er i.a. besonnene Zurückhaltung (p. 267: "Pourquoi refuser au prophète ce qu'on accorde à ses disciples...?").

Das Hauptgewicht dieses Kommentars liegt auf der Erschließung der sprachlichen Gestalt der vorliegenden Prophetenbücher und ihres Werdens, die in der klassischen Exegese überwiegend zu kurz kommt. Allerdings ist die wohl deutlich an der klassischen Philologie geschulte subtile Interpretationsmethode ständig in Gefahr, sich — etwa im Argumentieren mit Sprachbeweisen, Metrum oder gar Klangkombinationen — auf sehr unsicheren Boden zu begeben. Auch zeigt sich zuweilen deutlich, wie dringend nach wie vor eine kompetente Bearbeitung oder Wiedererwägung des (oder der?) hebräischen Tempussystems (-systeme?) wäre. Auf diesem Gebiet hat die Rez. manche Bedenken. So wird hebr. Perfekt (Pf. = AK) in Mich 1,11. 14 futurisch wiedergegeben, Mich 2,7; 4,12 präsentisch, in Zef 2,11 (p. 230) ein "pf. propheticum" angenommen, desgleichen zu Zef 3,18 (p. 258): "Le passé... a valeur du parfait prophétique, puisque les verbes qui suivent sont au futur". In Nah 1,14 (p. 290) wird ein pf. cons. mit einem Ausdruck der Vergangenheit wiedergegeben, während in Nah 1,5 die Folge pf-impf. cons. präsentisch übersetzt wird. Vielleicht hat der Verfasser für alle diese Entscheidungen gute Gründe, doch wären sie der Erläuterung wert.

Auch das sozusagen in der Luft hängende pf. cons. am Anfang des Zefanja-Corpus, falls dieses wirklich erst mit Zef 1,4 beginnt, müßte erklärt werden. Was soll es heißen, daß (p. 46) das Part. pass. Qal in Mich 2, 7 als "Jussiv" zu interpretieren sei? Wieso wird in Mich 4,1 ein "durativer Aspekt" einer "futurischen Handlung" verstärkt, indem das Part. Nif. mit dem impf. (PK) von יהיה verbunden wird? Hier liegt doch wohl eher ein verzeiterter Nominalsatz vor, wogegen ich mich scheuen würde, in Mich 5,3 impf. גרל mit "il sera grand" zu übersetzen. Ebenso erläuterungsbedürftig ist die futurische Wiedergabe eines Part. Nif. im Nominalsatz (Zef 2,11, p. 230), und völlig ungeklärt wirkt Mich 5,4a (p. 104). Soll wirklich שלום als constr.-Verbindung aufgefaßt werden? Wie ordnet sich diese syntaktisch ein? Hat nicht doch היה hier die gleiche Funktion der Satzverknüpfung wie in Mich 5,6.9?

"Un ouvrage n'est pas seulement la somme des éléments qui le composent" (p. 161), das gilt nicht nur für das Michabuch, sondern auch für diesen Kommentar. Seine Stärke ist die Gesamtschau der redaktionellen Einheit und ihres theologischen Zusammenhanges, d.h. der je eigenen Gewichtigkeit auch der "relecture". Dennoch kann auch er es nicht vermeiden, dabei (z.B. zu Zef 1,7-18, bes. p. 214ff.) bereits von einem bestimmten Bild der Prophetie auszugehen, das sozusagen stillschweigend vorausgesetzt ist. So rechnet er bei der "relecture intentionelle" immer wieder mit einer Ausweitung zur "dimension cosmique" (p. 245), bzw. umgekehrt wird diese zum Indiz der relecture. Auch zeigt sich, je mehr das Eigengewicht der relecture gewürdigt wird, auch immer deutlicher die Schwäche aller exegetischen Rekonstruktionen, daß wir nämlich letzten Endes nicht wissen, wie und in welchen Kreisen sich die relecture abspielte, also schließlich auch, ob "relecture"-Partien im wesentlichen das Werk von einzelnen oder das Ergebnis eines kollektiven Lern- und Verarbei-

tungsprozesses waren, der dann vielleicht unmittelbar in die Apokalyptik hätte führen können. Und wie lange blieb überhaupt kreative Ergänzung prophetischen Wortes in eigener prophetischer Autorität möglich, ab wann und wie so wich die auslegende Prophetie der Auslegung von Prophetie? — Was uns also noch fehlt (und vielleicht fehlen muß), ist der "Sitz im Leben" der sich vollziehenden relecture.

Vielleicht ist das überhaupt zuviel verlangt, und jedenfalls soll es nicht als Nörgelei an der Konzeption des hier besprochenen Kommentars erscheinen, der im Gegenteil, wie gerade die angemeldete weiterführende Kritik zeigen sollte, ein zum Mit- und Weiterarbeiten anregendes Buch ist, dessen speziellem Anliegen lebhaft Beachtung zu wünschen ist.

Austraße 114
CH - 4051 Basel

Ina WILLI-PLEIN

Mark A. THRONTVEIT, *When Kings Speak*. Royal Speech and Royal Prayer in Chronicles (SBL Dissertation Series 93). Decatur, GA, Scholars Press, 1987. 150 p. 21,5 × 14. US \$ 11.95.

During the past quarter of a century, the Books of Chronicles have been subjected to a number of critical investigations seeking to gain a clearer understanding of such matters as the date, authorship, compositional technique, and theological outlook of this body of biblical literature. The book under review is one of the latest in this series of studies devoted to the Chronicler. Originating as a 1982 PhD dissertation at Union Theological Seminary (Richmond, VA.) under the direction of Prof. Patrick D. Miller, Jr., this study is devoted to an examination of the royal speeches and prayers in the Books of Chronicles, with a view toward ascertaining their function in the structural framework and theological perspective of the Chronicler's history.

After a brief introductory chapter in which the dissertation is located within the larger field of modern critical discussion on the subject, Chap. 2 turns to an examination of the royal speeches in Chronicles. Only those indicative of the Chronicler's unique theological viewpoint are examined in detail by the author. They are identified on the basis of the following four criteria: 1. The speech is on the lips of a king; 2. The speech is not part of a conversation or dialogue; 3. The speech, though paralleled in the *Vorlage*, has been significantly altered; and 4. The speech is unique to the Chronicler. While the validity of most of these criteria is self-evident, the same cannot be said of criterion No. 2. Why should royal speeches which are part of a dialogue be ruled out in principle? Throntveit's explanation that these are rare in Chronicles as compared to the DtrH where they are frequent, is not adequate. Even a rarely used literary technique could conceivably yield valuable results in ascertaining the Chronicler's theological

viewpoint. One might also question the appropriateness of the use of the word "rare" when more than one third of all instances of royal speech (24 out of 64 by the author's own count) are eliminated from consideration on the basis of criterion No. 2 alone. In fairness, it should be noted, however, that this omission appears to be only a minor methodological flaw. The reviewer is satisfied that the author's conclusions in this chapter would not have been materially affected by the inclusion of the passages ruled out by the application of criterion No. 2.

The author's chief effort in this chapter is devoted to a detailed examination of the 26 speeches which meet all the criteria established by the author. On the basis of their structure, and following an earlier analysis by Roddy L. Braun, the speeches are grouped into three categories of Edicts, Rationales, and Orations. It was not clear to this reviewer what difference such a formal distinction made for one's understanding of the structure and theology of the Chronicler's history. Such a formal structural analysis seemed rather incidental to the author's main purpose and yielded no significant insights into the Chronicler's history. Furthermore, the differentiation between Edicts and Orations was so minor as to appear inconsequential. By far the most significant result of Chap. 2 was the author's recognition and insistence that the royal speeches do occur (contrary to Martin Noth) at important turning points in the narrative and that they are determinative of the structural framework of the Chroniclers' history.

Chap. 3 is devoted to an examination of royal prayers in Chronicles. These are identified on the basis of the following four criteria: 1. The prayer is on the lips of a king; 2. The prayer is reported in direct discourse; 3. The prayer is unique to Chronicles; and 4. The prayer, though paralleled in the *Vorlage*, has been significantly altered. On the basis of these criteria, ten prayers are identified and examined, but only six of these are judged to be significant as being reflective of the Chronicler's thought. Throntveit concludes that the royal prayers are quite similar in form to the royal speeches, except that the former are addressed to God, whereas the latter are addressed to human beings. With regard to content, the prayers employ portions of the lament to repeatedly make one point: the contrast between the power and might of Yahweh and the weakness and dependence of his people. One cannot help but wonder whether that is not a characteristic of biblical prayer in general, rather than a peculiar theological perspective of the Chronicler.

In Chap. 4, the author turns to the question of what light his investigation has shed on the Chronicler's theological *Tendenz*. He does this in dialogue with the earlier work on the synoptic portions of Chronicles by W. E. Lemke (*Synoptic Studies in the Chronicler's History*; Harvard ThD dissertation, 1963). The results of Throntveit's examination for the most part confirm the results of Lemke's earlier work, modifying or supplementing it only in minor details. The author's claim that they also disconfirm some of the several theological motivations of the Chronicler established by Lemke is not very well grounded. For one, the author's data base is too small, comprising only 32 texts (26 royal speeches and 6 royal prayers). So even if a specific theological *Tendenz* established on the basis of Lemke's

investigation of 127 synoptic texts should fail to appear in any of Throntveit's 32 non-synoptic texts, this would not mean that such a theological *Tendenz* is thereby disproved. Furthermore, given the nature of the Chronicler's compositional technique, certain instances of theological *Tendenz* one would not expect to find in the non-synoptic portions of the Chronicler's history. For example, if the Chronicler touches up or idealizes the picture of pious Judean kings by omitting unfavorable details in the synoptic parallels of Samuel-Kings, rather than by fabricating favorable stories of his own, one would not expect this theme to show up in the non-synoptic portions. And lastly, Throntveit's claim (pp. 84-86) that the Chronicler's solicitous concern for remnants of the North-Israelite population provides negative evidence for the Chronicler's anti-Northern polemic posited by Lemke rests on the author's misunderstanding of the nature of this polemic. Such a concern for the *people* of the North fits in well with the Chronicler's concern for "all Israel", which is not at all at odds with his anti-Northern polemic. Such a polemic, as described by Lemke (pp. 243-244), was not so much directed against the people of the northern kingdom, as it was directed against its apostate dynasty and cult. There is, thus, no conflict here at all. In short, Throntveit's work cannot be said to have seriously called into question any of the seven theological motifs identified by Lemke. The author may, however, be said to have been more successful in identifying perhaps two additional theological themes not found in Lemke's earlier study of the synoptic portions. And these are: 1. A Theology of "Rest", in which the Chronicler emphasizes the idea of a God-given rest in the promised land, culminating in the building of the Solomonic Temple; and 2. Help from Yahweh alone, an emphasis found frequently in the royal speeches and prayers, which contrasts the omnipotence of God with the dependence of his people.

Chaps. 5 and 6 are devoted to a redaction-critical analysis of 1 Chronicles 29 and the question of dating the Chronicler. Following the lead of Freedman, Cross, and others, Throntveit opts for a date of the Chronicler's basic history during the early restoration period, late in the 6th century (ca. 527-517 BCE). Throntveit argues that the Chronicler's conception of theocracy as embracing both king and high priest is close to that of Zechariah 1-8. This, of course, necessitates the assumption that the work of Ezra and Nehemiah was not part of the original Chronicler's history.

In the last chapter of this book, the author examines the Chronicler's periodization of history. After analyzing briefly the contributions by M. Noth, O. Ploeger, R. L. Braun, and H. G. M. Williamson, Throntveit presents a good case for arguing that the royal speeches in Chronicles have structural significance for the Chronicler's periodization of history. They picture the monarchy as moving from political unity, through disunity, and back again to unity in three periods. During the period of the united monarchy, emphasis is placed on the unity of David and Solomon as characteristic of the unity of North and South. During the period of the divided monarchy, the only hope for unity lies in "seeking Yahweh", as exemplified by Jehoshaphat the paradigmatic king of the period, in accordance with the word of God through the prophets. The period of the re-united monarchy

is ushered in through the work of Hezekiah and Josiah, who are pictured as comprising elements of both David and Solomon, and work towards the unified state.

In conclusion, what can we say regarding the overall significance of this work? Throntveit's *When Kings Speak* is one of several recent monographs and studies of the Books of Chronicles seeking to advance our understanding of the theology of the Chronicler. In spite of some weaknesses in methodology and argument, the book must be judged to be a significant, if not highly original, contribution to the current scholarly discussion pertaining to date, structure, and meaning of the Chronicler's history. Throntveit examines a small but significant portion of that history. The author is conversant with recent literature on the subject and for the most part utilizes the work of others well in staking out his own position. Occasionally, differences between himself and others are given undue significance or appear somewhat exaggerated. His most significant contribution to the discussion, perhaps, is found in the last chapter of his book, where he calls attention to the significance of the royal speeches for understanding the structure and theology of the Chronicler's history. The book is also clearly and interestingly written, something which one cannot take for granted with books originating as doctoral dissertations. In this reviewer's judgement, this book is a modest, though not insignificant, contribution to the field.

Colgate Rochester Divinity School
Bexley Hall/Crozer
1100 South Goodman Street
Rochester, NY 14620 U.S.A.

Werner E. LEMKE

Novum Testamentum

Bruce M. METZGER, *The Canon of the New Testament: Its Origin, Development, and Significance*. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1987. v-326 p. 22 x 14,6. £ 30.00.

With this attractive, well-documented, and typically lucid exposition of the historical problem of the Canon, Professor Metzger completes a trilogy on the New Testament text from the same publisher which includes *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration* (1964), and *The Early Versions of the New Testament: Their Origin, Transmission, and Limitations* (1977). The three make outstanding equipment for any serious student of the field, all the better for their concentration on objective exposure of the data rather than creative hypotheses dedicated to historical or theological systematizing. One might occasionally wish for sharper contours in the story told, perhaps a clearer profile of an author or a process, perhaps some interpretive key to the larger issues that are repeatedly at stake in particular developments; but one can hardly expect a better coverage of the witness to our Scripture's history, in terms of either comprehensive documen-

tation or the largesse and moderation of judgment which voices of a formative past deserve, be they mainstream or refractory ones.

M. is rightly committed to the principle that the New Testament canon is a product of history, not theological necessity. He shows his moderate temperament in defending this principle against the canonical "mystique" of B. S. Childs (*The New Testament as Canon*) and his school, on the one side (pp. 35f.), and the wanton indifference to the traditional canon's boundaries shown, on the opposite front, by historians like H. Koester (p. 166, n. 3). Although the "fringes" of the canon remained unsettled for centuries, with books like Hebrews, Revelation, James, and Jude moving alternately on and off the lists while other, Hermas, the Clementines, et al., make tentative appearances here and there, a remarkably broad acceptance of the major New Testament writings — four gospels, Acts, and apostolic letters — was achieved within the first two centuries in widely scattered Christian sectors. Nor can the process of delimitation be considered accidental or arbitrary, for a threefold criteriology of *regula fidei*, apostolicity, and continuous usage was firmly in place, albeit with different applications and priorities, by the second century's end (cf. Irenaeus, Tertullian, the *Muratorianum*). On the other side of the issue, however, a Christian Scripture other than the Old Testament was as yet unknown to the Apostolic Fathers, and as late as the fourth century, when Eusebius labored to draw up a balance-sheet between Christian "homologumena" and "antilegomena" (*Hist. eccl.* III, 25, 1-7), he had no "official declaration having an absolute value, such as a canon issued by a synod, or the collective agreement among churches or bishops" to go by, so his research produced a confused statement at best (p. 202)! Apparently his vast cloud of witnesses had not yet discerned the inherent harmonies and "referentialities" which are so patent to Childs and the "canonical" critics.

The reader gets a quick sketch of the formative period, from the beginnings through the definitive (though not uncontested) letter of Athanasius in AD 367, in M's brief introduction. His prelude to the historical survey, which will be the soul and substance of the work, also includes a bibliographical essay on modern studies of the Canon, from the Enlightenment to the present. This entry previews the strengths and weaknesses of the book as a whole, for it demonstrates the author's remarkably broad cultivation and his gifts of acuity and conciseness, yet it has little more narrative continuity than an annotated bibliography and offers less than satisfactory insight into the aetiology and course of the modern discussion.

Part II, the historical account of the canon's formation, finds the author in his *métier*, and this is where he shines. From the Apostolic Fathers, who knew both oral traditions and some few writings as authoritative, though scarcely yet "canonical", M. leads us through the major second and third-century developments that encouraged the canonization process — Gnosticism, Marcion, Montanism, book-burning persecutions — and then auditions the principal voices of East and West, respectively, which guided the process. For each witness, we are given a succinct *bios*, a summary of literary works, and a specific appraisal of contributions made to the canon-question. The effect is a very engaging and illuminating account of the emergence of a scripture which Athanasius finally delimited, AD 367, at the twenty-seven books (though not in the order) familiar

to us, now under a "canonical" stricture: *mēde prostheinaī mēde aphelein* (p. 212). To put this quite irregular evolution into perspective, M. adds a chapter introducing the apocryphal literature, "books of temporary and local canonicity". He brings out effectively how, in both their genres and their contents, these "dandelions" in the early Christian garden were conscious analogues and inferior responses to the canonical books, not competitors of equal pedigree which lost out by arbitrary ecclesiastical selection. Some of the urgency of the initiatives to close the scriptural canon undoubtedly came from the proliferation of these "hidden" scriptures, known already in uncomfortable array to the Muratorian author and Origen, and owing their existence, said the latter, to authors who "rushed hastily to write without having the grace of the Holy Spirit" (p. 137).

The historical account concludes its bifurcated course with the attempts at closing the canon, in the East first, then the West. We are shown how many threads are still dangling among the medieval churches of the East, whose lists still excluded Revelation (and even the smaller catholic epistles) while admitting variously the Clementines, Third Corinthians, or sundry other apocrypha. In the West, too, Hebrews and the *catholicae* remained unstable among the Reformers and their followers, but the hoary Pauline forgery called Laodiceans was still there to be read in all pre-Lutheran German bibles. It was, of course, the Council of Trent which made the present twenty-seven books of the New Testament, along with the fifty-four of the Vulgate's Old Testament, *materia fidei* for the first time in the history of the Church.

As the grammar of his exposition, M. appears to prefer parataxis over hypotaxis. By that I mean that he prefers to lay out the witnesses of his history, and even more its aetiological factors, side by side rather than in a clear hierarchy of importance. He refuses to overvalue Marcion, for example, as the architect of a model of the mainstream canon that was mounted to counteract his, *pace* Harnack and Campenhausen (pp. 98f.). He is content to cite the three principal criteria of canonicity — rule of faith, apostolicity, continuous use — noting different priorities assigned them by the Fathers, as against, say, Campenhausen's argument that the rule of faith was consistently decisive, apostolic provenance subordinate (see *The Formation of the Christian Bible* [London-Philadelphia 1972] 330, *et passim*). Such equanimity before large theological issues in the story will disappoint theologians; but then, M. will justly reply that no one pays the historian to do the theologian's work, least of all nowadays! And weighing the rule of faith against the apostolic principle probably services modern theological debate at the expense of a fully attentive patristic sounding.

Nevertheless, this reviewer occasionally chafes at M's detachment. Tatian is one figure of canon-history whom it short-changes, in my opinion. His importance to M. seems to lie mainly in the fact that he chose *these* four gospels to merge in his *Diatessaron* (p. 115), whereas the fact of this astonishing initiative in substituting the harmony for the separate gospel-books is treated as an idiosyncrasy whose lack of church-wide acceptance can pass practically without explanation. Once we hear that Tatian's reputation as a heretic discouraged the continued use of his harmony in the churches of Syria (p. 218), but by the time we get to the meager page-and-a-half devoted

to the plurality of the gospels among the canon's "historical and theological problems" (Part III), we have heard little or nothing from the witnesses as to why they attached surpassing importance to hearing the four gospels in all their redundancies and discordances. Here is certainly a point of convergence for the recurrent issues of *regula fidei*, apostolicity, and continuous use; and it would be interesting to know which of them weighed heaviest against the "convenience" of the *Diatessaron*.

The postponement of such key issues of the larger story to Part III makes the brief treatment some of them get seem rather perfunctory. This is true also of the "particularity of the Pauline epistles" (2 pages), which also got little elucidation during the historical survey. The projection of Paul's authentic letters beyond their original address to become universal *lectio divina* took place in stages now largely hidden from the historian's probe, so one cannot complain that M. hides things from us. Yet the ease with which early Christians could hear themselves addressed in the highly specific discourse of the Corinthian letters or Galatians, say, compared closely with their preference for hearing the narrative gospel in four competing versions rather than one emulsified one. Both phenomena have everything to do with the way they understood the word of God, the gospel, which had passed uneasily into documentary form in all these writings. So far from equivocating or confusing the gospel, the particular address in each literary instance was of the very nature of it, a living word on live target rather than a codified deposit for lump-sum appropriation *semper et ubique*. Delving deeply into issues like this might have carried the author beyond his purpose and profession, but it is hard to get a grip on the formation of a Christian scripture without a somewhat larger hearing on them than he has granted to his witnesses.

Among "questions concerning the canon today" (chap. XII), one relishes the balanced views and common-sense answers with which M. treats questions like "which form of the text is canonical?" (the book as book, not one or another form or version), and "is the canon open or closed?" (the canon, like the history that gave it, cannot be remade). Less ready approval from all quarters will greet the substantial discussion, "is there a canon within the canon?" After rightly rejecting the existential-kerygmatic test of W. Marxsen, M. finds more serious grounds for the dual standard of "canon" in the contradictions and strains within the literary canon which seem to require critical judgment of where the divine word is to be located among them (Vielhauer, Käsemann, et al.); but then he is content to close the issue with trite disclaimers: the arbitrary "eye of the beholder", shifting critical tempers from age to age, and the peril of silencing individual voices that are out of the swim. A more serious dialogue with Käsemann was in order here, especially with his critical survey in the symposium, *Das Neue Testament als Kanon* (Göttingen 1970). Is the critical articulation of the gospel within the canon anything very different from what the Master himself did in identifying "the great commandment" of the law, using two passages from two distinct books for the purpose? Did Paul not follow suit in pinpointing the place where the Torah "proclaimed the gospel beforehand", Gen 12,3 (Gal 3,8)? Here, indeed, was a shift of interior canons "from age to age", but does this make the two of them "scarcely worthy of the name" (p. 282)?

And within Paul himself, what is a serious, reflective believer — one not content with a catholicity of *fides implicita* — to make of the situation between the two fronts, anti-paulinists in Galatia and hyper-paulinists in Corinth? Against the first, the erasure of all Torah-based differences amongst people is proclaimed — Jew-Greek, slave-free, male-female (Gal 3,26-28) — whereas the enthusiasts get their wings clipped with a series of sophistries that rebuilds the barriers between men and women in the church (1 Cor 11,2-16)! Where, between the two passages, is a functional “measure” by which the demand of the gospel can be distinguished from a prudential restraint of its “shock-troops”? Does the decision in favor of one passage really “silence” the other? And suppose we returned to segregated church-aisles in the twenty-first century; would 1 Cor 11 then be defensibly identified as Paul’s gospel within his canon? Or would there be something objectively wrong with such exegesis in any age?

These questions to M. are posed with the greatest respect, for this is a first-class introduction by a first-class scholar of the text. Not the least of the dividends his work pays its reader is the fascinating series of appendices, which includes a history of the usage of the word “canon” (first used of Scripture in the fourth-century), a survey of the very varied sequences in which the New Testament books are presented down through the Middle Ages, a sketch of the gradual development of titles for the sacred books, and, undoubtedly most valuable to the student, a documentary appendix containing a dozen early lists of the books, from the Muratorian (before AD 200) to that of the third synod of Carthage (AD 397).

All in all, there is scarcely a better book with which to gain perspective on an historical process whose beginnings and principal pathways run continually in and out of the heavy mists of church history.

Fordham University
Bronx, New York 10458
U.S.A.

Richard J. DILLON

Xavier LÉON-DUFOUR, *Lectures de l'évangile selon Jean*. Tome I, (chapitres 1–4) (Parole de Dieu). Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1988. 432 p. 20,5 × 14. FF 149.

Mit dem vorliegenden Band beginnt der Pariser Neutestamentler mit der Veröffentlichung der Frucht seiner jahrzehntelangen Arbeit am Johannesevangelium. Wer ihn kennt, ist nicht überrascht, diese Synthese nicht einfach in der Form eines Kommentars vorgelegt zu finden. Ein Kommentar sammelt gelehrte Information über das auszulegende Werk. L.-D. möchte eher zu einem geistlichen Verständnis hinführen. Im Vordergrund sollen der Text und seine “Lektüre” stehen, nicht die Methoden und Probleme seiner Auslegung. Darum der Titel und die Anlage des Werkes (9f). Wieviel Gelehrsamkeit hinter dieser Auslegung steht, wird dem Leser freilich nicht nur aus den Fußnoten deutlich. L.-D. überblickt nicht nur die französischsprachige Forschung

zum Vierten Evangelium, sondern auch einen guten Teil der angelsächsischen und deutschsprachigen, so daß der Leser bei aller Konzentration auf den Text zugleich auch einen Einblick in die internationale Arbeit am Vierten Evangelium erhält.

Die Eigenart dieses "Kommentars" (der keiner sein will) wird vor allem deutlich, wenn wir nach seiner literarischen, seiner religionskritischen und seiner theologischen Position fragen. Literarisch bekennt sich die Studie L.-D.s zum Vorrang der "synchrone" vor der "diachrone" Textbetrachtung (vgl. 21-23). Der Text soll also zunächst einmal aus sich heraus ausgelegt und seine "Botschaft" (23) herausgearbeitet werden. Diese Option L.-D.s überrascht nicht, liegt sie doch im Rahmen eines sich heute allgemein vollziehenden Paradigmenwechsels in der Exegese. Freilich sind es zunächst nicht die neuen Auslegungsmethoden als solche, die L.-D. in ihren Bann ziehen, sondern eher die Feststellung des Versagens der alten Methoden — L.-D. denkt konkret an seinen Landsmann M.-E. Boismard oder Bultmann und seine Schule in Deutschland (22). Die Methoden, mit denen L.-D. seinen Text aufschließt, bleiben ihrerseits eher traditionell: voran steht die Bestimmung der Struktur von Texten durch Aufspüren von Inklusionen, Parallelismen, Stichwörtern usw. (24). Stilistische Verschiebungen können hinzukommen (24f). Mehr im Sinne einer narrativen Analyse können innerhalb eines Textes auch Reihen von Oppositionen herausgearbeitet werden (25), all dies im Sinne "d'une saine linguistique" (ebd.). Gegenüber den eigentlich textlinguistischen Methoden bleibt L.-D. eher auf Distanz. Vielleicht wäre eine klare Abfolge von Syntaktik, Semantik und Pragmatik der einzelnen Abschnitte in der Tat für einen volkstümlichen Kommentar zu technisch gewesen; als Vorarbeit hätte sie die Strukturvorschläge L.-D.s jedoch vielleicht auf eine etwas sicherere Grundlage gestellt. Nach L.-D. gehört viel "Humor" (30; vgl. 44) dazu, weitere Strukturvorschläge zum Johannesevangelium und seinen Hauptteilen zu machen. Diese Selbsteinschätzung berührt sympathisch, doch läßt das verstärkte Bemühen um allgemein akzeptierte Prinzipien der Strukturierung und Auslegung von Texten doch auf die Dauer auch genauere Ergebnisse erhoffen. Dies gilt auch für den Prolog, den L.-D. noch stark nach einem heilsgeschichtlichen Schema, d.h. nach inhaltlichen Kriterien gliedert (die Verse Joh 1,1-8 sprechen noch vom *logos asarkos*; am Ende steht das Zeugnis des Täufers nur vom "Licht", nicht von Jesus; dann folgt die Rede vom *logos ensarkos*, die mit dem Zeugnis des Täufers vom Fleischgewordenen endet. Die Lichtmetaphorik für Jesus, die sich durch das ganze Johannesevangelium zieht, macht diesen Vorschlag wenig wahrscheinlich).

Der Verzicht auf die Annahme von Quellenschriften und schriftlichen Vorlagen des Johannesevangeliums wirkt sich selbstverständlich auf die theologischen Ergebnisse aus. Entgegen einer weitverbreiteten Meinung verzichtet L.-D. auf die Voraussetzung einer "Zeichenquelle", was zur Folge hat, daß die Perikope von der Hochzeit zu Kana (Joh 2,1-11) bruchlos zu interpretieren ist. L.-D. löst die Spannung zwischen dem Duktus der Geschichte zu einer Offenbarung der Herrlichkeit Jesu vor den Jüngern im "Zeichen" und dem retardierenden Dialog Jesu mit seiner Mutter durch den Übersetzungsvorschlag: "Ist meine Stunde denn noch nicht gekommen?" (230). Die Geschichte wird dann im Sinne einer endzeitlichen Of-

fenbarung Gottes in der Herrlichkeit des irdischen Jesus interpretiert. Doch der Preis ist hoch, denn überall sonst im Johannesevangelium ist die "Stunde Jesu" eindeutig an seine Heimkehr zum Vater und die darin liegende "Verherrlichung" gebunden (vgl. 7,30; 8,20; 13,1 — Texte, auf die L.-D. in der anschließenden "Ouverture", d.h. aktualisierenden Auslegung, aber nur dort, selber verweist: 242).

Gegenüber religionskritischen Ableitungen johanneischer Themen bleibt L.-D. insgesamt eher auf Distanz. Bevorzugt werden durchweg biblische Vorbilder. Dies gilt etwa vom johanneischen Logos: als solcher kennt er keine direkten Vorlagen (55f); am nächsten kommen ihm Aussagen in den Weisheitsbüchern des AT vom Kommen der Weisheit zu Israel (56-62). Ausserbiblische jüdische Texte dienen gelegentlich als "Brücke" zwischen den beiden Testamenten, wie etwa bei der Erklärung des Brunnens in Joh 4 (348f), bleiben sonst aber eher selten. Gegenüber religionsgeschichtlichen Parallelen aus dem außerbiblischen Hellenismus bleibt L.-D. durchweg auf Distanz — so etwa bei der Frage einer Beziehung zwischen dem Dionysos-Kult und dem Verwandlungswunder von Kana Joh 2,1-11 (für dieses Wunder als "Geschenkswunder" fehlen eigentliche biblische Parallelen).

Hinter dieser religionskritischen Position steht letztlich eine theologische, die L.-D. bereits in der Einleitung klar bezieht: seine Überzeugung von der "Einheit des göttlichen Heilsratschlusses" nach dem Johannesevangelium (27). Sie wird in der Tat in der Forschung oft zu wenig herausgestellt, und sie konsequent immer wieder in den Blick zu nehmen, gehört zu den großen Stärken der Auslegung von L.-D. Über Einzelheiten der Verbindung vom Alten Bund zum Neuen mag man dann immer noch streiten, so über die Frage, ob man in Joh 3,5 die Wiedergeburt aus "Wasser und Geist" im Sinne einer Gleichsetzung von Wasser und Geist nach Ez 36,25-27 verstehen darf (292) — das johanneische "und" spricht eigentlich dagegen.

Beachtung und Zustimmung verdient auch der Vorschlag L.-D.s, die alles überragende Rolle der "Theologie", d.h. der Aussagen über Gott den Vater im Vierten Evangelium zu betonen (26f). Ihnen bleiben selbst die christologischen Aussagen noch untergeordnet, wie man strukturell vor allem an den Jesusreden aufzeigen kann. Behält man dieses Anliegen im Blick, dann könnte auch noch einmal überlegt werden, ob hinter dem "Säenden" von Joh 4,36 nicht eher Gott als Christus steht (vgl. 386, doch dazu jetzt T. Okure, *The Johannine Approach to Mission* [Tübingen 1988]). Christus tritt auch hier nur in das Werk ein, das der Vater begonnen hat und abschließt.

Insgesamt bedeutet die Auslegung L.-D.s einen Fortschritt auch für den christlich-jüdischen Dialog. Vielen gilt das Johannesevangelium bis heute als Inbegriff eines christlichen Antijudaismus. Die hier vorgelegte Auslegung macht Ernst mit der Tatsache, daß nicht nur nach Paulus (Röm 9-11), sondern auch nach Johannes die Kirche nur in die Verheißungen eintritt, die Israel zuteil wurden und die Gott nicht zurücknimmt (vgl. 396-401).

Uhlanderstraße 60
D- 6000 Frankfurt/M. 1

Johannes BEUTLER S.J.

Lars AEJMEAEUS, *Die Rezeption der Paulusbriefe in der Miletrede (Apg 20:18-35)* (Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia Toimituksia – Annales Academiae Scientiarum Fennicae B 232). Helsinki, Suomalainen Tiedeakatemia, 1987. 297 p. 24 × 16,5.

A condition que le mot «Rezeption» ne soit pas entendu dans un sens technique qu'il n'a pas ici, le titre de cet ouvrage indique bien la thèse qu'il se propose de défendre: il s'agit de prouver l'utilisation («Benutzung», «Verwendung») des lettres de Paul, ou au moins de certaines d'entre elles, dans le discours de Milet. Dans les Actes, ce discours est le seul que Paul adresse à des chrétiens. Cette circonstance fait de lui un terrain privilégié pour une confrontation avec les épîtres et donc aussi pour la mise en question par laquelle l'A. veut s'opposer à l'opinion la plus courante chez les exégètes, qui ne croient pas à une dépendance de Luc à l'égard des lettres de Paul. L'A. ne se cache pas la difficulté de la tâche qu'il entreprend. Il sait qu'en bon historien de son temps, Luc ne saurait manquer de remodeler dans son propre style les matériaux qu'il emprunte à ses sources (voir surtout p. 96s.). Il lui faudra donc aller jusqu'aux «racines» d'un discours qui est incontestablement lucanien et qui reflète naturellement la situation du moment où il a été composé. Ajoutons que «l'utilisation» dont il s'agit peut être comprise dans un sens très large, ne supposant pas nécessairement l'emploi d'un texte écrit: pour qu'elle se vérifie, il suffit que Luc se souvienne d'une lecture entendue lors d'une assemblée et en exprime le sens à sa manière (p. 66).

Une assez longue introduction (p. 11-88) énonce le projet de l'A. et l'explique par rapport à l'état actuel de la recherche: il lui paraît invraisemblable *a priori* que, comme on le suppose habituellement, Luc n'ait pas connu et utilisé les épîtres. Cette introduction contient aussi d'utiles observations d'ensemble sur les Actes en général et sur le discours de Milet en particulier.

Dans la partie centrale de son livre (p. 89-195), l'A. porte son effort essentiel sur l'identification des matériaux pauliniens qui ont pu servir de base à la composition du discours de Milet. A un niveau superficiel, la statistique des mots employés révèle simplement la présence de quelques «paulinismes» (vv. 19, 24 et 32). Pour aller plus avant, il importe d'envisager successivement chacune des petites unités du discours, correspondant à peu près à la numérotation de ses versets. Chaque unité est confrontée à ses parallèles, et il apparaît assez vite que ceux-ci sont fournis avant tout par le corpus paulinien et très particulièrement par la 1^{re} aux Thessaloniens. Certes, les ressemblances vont de pair avec bien des différences. Mais l'A. estime que celles-ci sont explicables par les points de vue respectifs des auteurs. Il aboutit ainsi à la conclusion que Luc a rédigé le discours de Milet en prenant directement appui sur le texte de la 1^{re} aux Thessaloniens, qu'il devait avoir sous les yeux. Deux passages surtout lui ont été utiles: 1 Th 1,10-2,13 et 5,9-14. En outre, Luc doit une partie de ses matériaux à l'Épître aux Ephésiens, l'Épître aux Philippiens et la 1^{re} aux Corinthiens. Pour les lettres aux Romains et aux Galates, l'A. se montre plus réservé. En dehors du corpus paulinien, il faut évidemment faire place pour une influence de la LXX, mais aussi pour un emprunt à Mc 13 et un autre qui proviendrait de la *Prima Clementis*. Les Pastorales n'entrent pas en

ligne de compte, car ce sont elles qui dépendraient du discours de Milet (p. 60).

Après le copieux relevé de textes et les comparaisons minutieuses qui occupent le centre du volume, deux compléments se proposent non plus d'établir la dépendance du discours de Milet à l'égard des lettres de Paul, mais de prévenir les objections que cette éventualité ne peut manquer de soulever. Il s'agit d'abord, sous la forme d'un excursus (p. 196-210), de répondre à la question de savoir si le récit que les Actes font de la naissance de l'Eglise de Thessalonique et des événements qui ont suivi n'est pas à ce point inconciliable avec les données de la 1^{re} aux Thessaloniens qu'il exclut chez son auteur la connaissance de cette lettre. La difficulté que soulèvent les désaccords, d'ailleurs incontestables, pourrait être surmontée assez facilement si l'on admet qu'à côté de la 1^{re} aux Thessaloniens, Luc dispose aussi d'un Journal de voyage dont il suit le canevas sans trop se soucier des indications divergentes qui peuvent être dégagées de la lettre de Paul.

Le second complément, qui prend les proportions d'une nouvelle partie du livre (p. 211-268), veut dépasser le niveau de l'expression du discours de Milet et s'interroger sur les accords ou les désaccords plus profonds du contenu de ce discours avec la pensée de Paul telle qu'elle nous apparaît dans les épîtres. Il faut reconnaître, par exemple, que la présence et le rôle des «presbytres» à Ephèse s'accordent mal avec ce que les épîtres nous apprennent sur la nature des relations existant entre les croyants dans les communautés pauliniennes. Mais n'est-il pas normal que l'auteur des Actes projette sur le temps de Paul l'organisation ecclésiastique de son propre temps? Ou encore, on peut s'étonner à première vue que Luc ne dise pratiquement rien du véritable motif du dernier voyage de Paul à Jérusalem. Ce silence ne signifie pas qu'il ignorait le but de Paul en entreprenant ce voyage; il s'explique tout naturellement à partir de la connaissance du fait que ce but a été manqué. De telles différences d'éclairage ne sauraient valoir comme preuves que Luc n'a pas connu et utilisé les lettres de Paul.

Une bibliographie et de bons index terminent l'ouvrage, attestant encore que l'information de l'A. est, sinon sans lacunes, du moins, très large. Le travail qu'il conduit à contre-courant, mettant en cause des opinions généralement reçues, mérite d'être abordé avec intérêt et sympathie, d'autant plus qu'il se montre lucide sur la difficulté de son entreprise. Nous ne pensons pas que les arguments «de convenance» auxquels s'attarde un peu l'introduction impressionneront beaucoup les exégètes, et nous avons dit que les considérations de la dernière partie du livre n'ont pour but que d'écarter les objections que soulève la thèse de l'utilisation des lettres de Paul par l'auteur des Actes. La démonstration de cette thèse se concentre essentiellement dans les rapprochements proposés et interprétés dans la partie centrale du livre. Nous rendons volontiers hommage au soin avec lequel ce travail a été mené. — Un curieux oubli cependant: le titre christologique «Notre Seigneur» (Ac 20,21) ne revient chez Luc qu'en Ac 15,26 (dans un compliment que la lettre de l'assemblée apostolique adresse à Barnabé et Paul), mais est fréquent dans les lettres de Paul. — Il semble incontestable que le grand nombre des «parallèles» rapprochés du discours de Milet aident à mieux comprendre celui-ci. Il n'est pas sans intérêt de constater que ces «parallèles» proviennent si souvent des épîtres

pauliniennes, tout particulièrement de la 1^{re} aux Thessaloniens. Mais le caractère approximatif de ces «parallèles» ne saurait échapper au lecteur. Pour admettre une relation de dépendance, se rendra-t-il aux explications ingénieuses qui invoquent la liberté avec laquelle Luc se doit de remanier la teneur de ses sources et de marquer de son empreinte le discours qu'il compose? Ou du moins se laissera-t-il convaincre par l'effet cumulatif de rapprochements qui, pris isolément, resteraient chaque fois sujets à caution? L'intrépidité avec laquelle l'A. construit sa démonstration provoque une admiration dangereusement mêlée d'inquiétude devant la fragilité des arguments dont il dispose. Il faut bien avouer que, malgré toutes ses qualités, ce plaidoyer en faveur de l'utilisation des lettres de Paul par l'auteur des Actes risque d'apparaître comme la défense d'une cause désespérée.

Monastère Saint-André
Allée de Clerlande, 1
B — 1340 Ottignies

Jacques DUPONT

WILHELM PRATSCHER, *Der Herrenbruder Jakobus und die Jakobustradition* (Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments 139). Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1987. 315 p. 23,3 x 16. Dm 78.

James the Lord's brother was beyond question one of the leading figures in the early Church, although on the evidence of the Synoptic Gospels he was not among Jesus' disciples during his earthly ministry. By the time of Paul's first visit to Jerusalem (Gal 1,19) he was certainly a member of the Christian community, indeed on one interpretation of the verse ranking as an apostle; but while P. thinks this interpretation highly probable it is by no means beyond dispute. By the time of the "council" visit (Gal 2,1 ff.) some years later he had become one of the *δοκοῦντες*, also described as the *στῦλοι*, the leading figures of the community, and indeed in 2,9 he is named as the first of the three. It is reasonable enough to link his "conversion" with the appearance of the risen Jesus recorded at 1 Cor 15,7, later elaborated on in the Gospel of the Hebrews.

The New Testament references to him are limited in scope, and leave many questions without any definite answer: his relationship to Jesus, and the vision of 1 Cor 15,7, would certainly have given him prestige and status, but whether they would justify the view that he already ranked as an apostle at Paul's first visit is another matter; as P. himself notes, in Gal 1,19 James is mentioned only in passing. On the other hand, there are certainly grounds for considering the suggestion that he was already the leader of a group within the Church, probably the more conservative among the Jewish Christians of Jerusalem. A further question relates to the *τινες ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου* of Gal 2,12: were they emissaries sent by James with the express purpose of putting a stop to the table-fellowship of Jewish and Gentile Christians at Antioch, or

were they envoys sent for some other purpose who overstepped their remit? What is their relation, if any, to the ψευδάδελφοί of Gal 2,4? In P's view these emissaries from James are *not* to be characterised as Judaisers: in contrast to the ψευδάδελφοί and Paul's opponents in Antioch (Acts 15,1) they directed their demands not to the Gentile but to the Jewish Christians. They were sent by James to put a stop to the table-fellowship, but that was out of concern for the attitude of the Jewish Christians, a concern to keep them firmly loyal to the Law. For this there were not only theological but "political" reasons: in the decades before the Jewish War the situation of the Christians in Palestine was becoming ever more dangerous (as is shown by the persecution first of Stephen and the Hellenists, then of the group around the Twelve, with the death of the sons of Zebedee and the flight of Peter, leaving James as the sole leader in Jerusalem, and finally by the martyrdom of James himself). Prudence, and the very survival of the nascent community, demanded the avoidance of anything that might cause offence. James thus emerges as a conservatively-minded Jewish Christian, concerned to maintain the fidelity of his fellow Jewish Christians to the Law, who did not however see the implications of the whole situation so clearly as did Paul. On the other hand he was not a Judaizer: Paul nowhere links him with the agitators in Galatia, and never attacks him, which as P. says is unthinkable had Paul known him to be the driving force behind the agitation.

From the New Testament evidence James does not appear as the dominant figure which he was to become in later tradition. Here we can trace the growth of a legend, first in Jewish-Christian circles, then in gnostic, and finally from the middle of the second century in the Great Church. Each of these groups shaped its own James; each of them preserved some features correctly, but none succeeded in getting the whole picture right. Here a comparison of this book with dictionary articles on James written around the beginning of the century is not without interest: such articles tend to concentrate on the New Testament material, with some reference towards the end to Hegesippus *apud* Eusebius, the Gospel of the Hebrews and the Pseudo-Clementines, and perhaps some patristic material. Such reference however is not always to be found, and is comparatively brief, with little or no assessment of the material other than for the historical James, which usually leads to negative conclusions. P. however has drawn together a mass of material from sources which then were in some cases simply not available, and has analysed it in detail to draw out the picture of James that was formed by each of the groups in question. The result is both instructive and illuminating.

Two passages in the Fourth Gospel (John 2,1 ff.; 7,1 ff.) present a different picture from the Synoptics as to the attitude of Jesus' family: so far from standing aloof, they are among his earliest followers (C. H. Dodd, *Historical Tradition in the Fourth Gospel* [Cambridge 1963] 235-236 and 246-247, ranks both passages among early pre-canonical tradition). These appear to afford the first evidence for a positive evaluation of the family of Jesus, and James in particular, which was to mark the Jewish-Christian tradition. The same positive attitude appears in a fragment assigned by P. Vielhauer (in *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, I. Evangelien [Hrsg. W. Schneemelcher] [Tübingen 1987]) to the Gospel of the Nazarenes (Jerome, *adv. Pelag* III 2), and a fur-

ther step is taken in the Gospel of the Hebrews (Jerome, *vir. ill.* 2), where James becomes the most significant witness to the Risen Christ and consequently the central figure of early Christianity. Here it must be emphasised that there is no question of ascribing historical value in the ordinary sense to the latter texts: what we are concerned with is the beginning of a legend. This is further developed in the extracts from Hegesippus preserved by Eusebius (esp. *HE* II 23, 4ff.): James is the true priest who alone may enter the sanctuary, the exemplary missionary, endowed with various titles of honour, installed as first leader of the post-Easter church; a long string of parallels shows the portrait of James to be consciously shaped after the presentation of Jesus in the Gospels, although he does not usurp the position of Jesus, he is simply exalted far above all other early Christians; the Fall of Jerusalem and the destruction of the Temple are seen as retribution for his martyrdom. Finally there is the evidence of the Pseudo-Clementines, not in themselves primary sources, but informative for the picture of James in Jewish-Christian circles.

The gnostic picture of James is drawn almost entirely from documents which have only recently become readily accessible: the Gospel of Thomas, the *Epistula Jacobi Apocrypha*, the two Apocalypses of James (the last three of these are also discussed, from another point of view, by C. Scholten, *Martyrium und Sophiamythos im Gnostizismus nach den Texten von Nag Hammadi* [JAC Erg. bd. 14; Münster 1987]). There is an apparent reference in one version of the Gospel of the Egyptians, but Böhlig has shown that the original reference was to the patriarch Jacob (*Nag Hammadi and Gnosis* [ed. R. McL. Wilson] [Leiden 1978] 122-130); possibly some copyist simply confused the two. There are some similar cases in Manichean sources, where James the Lord's brother is confused with the son of Zebedee or the son of Alphaeus.

In regard to the Gospel of Thomas a minor criticism falls to be made: in note 1 to page 151 the idiosyncracies of the English language have led to the listing of Walls and Gaertner on the side of Böhlig's rendering of logion 12, "wherever you have come from", over against that of Puech, "wherever you (shall have) come". This is incorrect, since neither has the essential "from", and Walls in fact is quoting the *editio princeps* (his note 4 on p. 266 should make it clear that he has a future reference in mind). The Coptic verb is in the perfect tense, but that is relative to the main verb: they have to arrive before they can go to James! The real crux relates to the Coptic adverb *mmau*, "there, therein" (Crum 196b), which can mean "whence" or "thence", more particularly in association with *ebol* ("out, away, from"); but there are a number of cases in which it seems to appear as a variant for *emau* "thither" (197a). As P. rightly notes, in Puech's rendering a future reference in Jesus' answer corresponds to a similar reference in the disciples' question, whereas on the other view it is not clear why Jesus should refer to the disciples' past in the first place. In favour of Böhlig's rendering, however, it may be noted that the phrase *pma nta=ei ebol mmau* is fairly common in the Nag Hammadi texts as a formula for derivation from the Pleroma (see F. Siegert, *Nag Hammadi Register* [Tübingen 1982] 36); but there is an *ebol* in every case except BG 19.15 (Siegert's 19.5 is an error), and BG has not

mmau but *mmof*. Logion 12 of the Gospel of Thomas is not listed by Siegert under this head.

Long ago Alexander Böhlig wrote of "die Umdeutung von jüdischen Traditionsgut in gnostische Gedankengänge" (*Mysterion und Wahrheit* [Leiden 1968] 83); as the second part of his study shows (ibid. 102-111), this applies also to Jewish-Christian material. This may be seen very clearly in the gnostic picture of James: he becomes a gnostic Offenbarungsmittler, the prototype of the true gnostic; characteristic motifs of the original Jewish-Christian tradition such as observance of the Law are no longer relevant, and simply fall away. Here James is to some extent anti-Petrine and anti-Jewish, but not anti-Pauline. At one point in the Second Apocalypse (56.14-57.20), P. notes a link with the Johannine tradition: "*Aus dem unbekannten Lieblingsjünger des Johannevangeliums wäre dann der bekannte Lieblingsjünger einer bestimmten gnostischer Gruppe geworden*" (italics original). Curiously, nobody seems ever to have drawn upon the later James tradition to identify the unknown disciple of John 18,15, who was "known to the high priest", as James (although Zahn, according to Bultmann, thought of the son of Zebedee); but that would be mere speculation (Bultmann and Barrett in their commentaries, for example, suggest that he is there only to explain how Peter was able to gain an entry).

Finally we come to the portrait of James in the mainstream Christian tradition. Here the Jewish-Christian picture is neutralised, and James incorporated into the apostolic succession; he is the first bishop of Jerusalem (not, as in the Jewish-Christian tradition, of the whole Church), and Eusebius even has him rule like a bishop of his own day. Again, from Irenaeus on James becomes a major witness *against* the gnostics, precisely the opposite of the gnostic picture. It is in this period that we find the rise of the different views as to the relationship of the "brothers" to Jesus: first the "Helvidian" theory of full brotherhood, which the NT texts most naturally suggest and which still had adherents in the 4th century, but already from the middle of the 2nd century there is the rival view, associated especially with Epiphanius, that they were sons of Joseph by a previous marriage, and finally the Hieronymian view, developed in direct opposition to Helvidius, that they were cousins. The book is rounded off by a survey of the pseudepigraphical literature under the name of James and a discussion of the various reports of his martyrdom.

The author's concerns in this book are twofold: first to identify so far as possible the administrative standing occupied by James according to the various texts examined, and second to determine his theological position. In the nature of the case this is not an easy task, and as already hinted there are points at which another view is possible, but the texts are always carefully examined and judiciously assessed, with ample reference to the modern literature. Altogether this is a very complete and thorough study, which will provide a solid basis for future research.

10 Murrayfield Road
St. Andrews, Fife
Scotland KY16 9NB

R. McL. WILSON

NUNTII PERSONARUM ET RERUM

Pontificium Institutum Biblicum Annus academicus 1988-1989. I semestre

Auditores inscripti erant 314, qui in diversas categorias sic distribuebantur:

	Ad Doctoratum	Ad Licentiam	Hospites	Universi
Fac. Biblica	17	269	23	309
Fac. Orientalistica	—	2	3	5
Universi	17	271	26	314
Nationes	56	Alumni		314
Dioceses	158	Alumni		165
Inst. Religiosorum	51	Alumni		119
Inst. Religiosarum	14	Alumnae		14
Ex statu laicali	16	Alumnae		11
		Alumni		5

Laureae

Laureae in Re Biblica digni declarati sunt:

ELLIOTT, Sr. Mary Timothea, R.S.M. (07.XII.1988). *The Literary Unity of the Canticle* (Magna cum laude). Moderator: M. GILBERT.

MINDLING, P. Joseph Allen, O.F.M. Cap. (12.I.1989). *Conceptions of a Felicitous Afterlife in the Hebrew Old Testament* (Cum laude). Moderator: M. GILBERT.

Doctores in Re Biblica renuntiati sunt, typis edita thesi:

BARTHOLOMÉ, Juan J., *El evangelio y su verdad. La justificación por la fe y su vivencia en común. Un estudio exegético de Gal 2,5.14*. Roma 1988.

COSTACURTA, Bruna, *La vita minacciata. Il tema della paura nella Bibbia Ebraica* (Analecta Biblica 119). Roma 1988.

FISCHER, Georg, S.J., *Jahwe unser Gott. Sprache, Aufbau und Erzähltechnik in der Berufung des Mose (Ex 3-4)*. Innsbruck 1988.

MARIASELVAM, Abraham, *The Song of Songs and Ancient Tamil Love Poems. Poetry and Symbolism* (Analecta Biblica 118). Roma 1988.

MCCAFFREY, James, O.C.D., *The House with Many Rooms. The Temple Theme of Jn. 14,2-3* (Analecta Biblica 114). Roma 1988.

MORA PAZ, César Alejandro, *Dimensión socio-religiosa de la carta a Filemon. Su función comunicativa y su contenido* (extractum). Roma 1988.

WÉNIN, André, *Samuel et l'instauration de la monarchie (1 S 1-12). Une recherche littéraire sur le personnage*. Frankfurt am Main 1988.

LIBRI AD DIRECTIONEM MISSI

En este Elenco aparecen todos los libros enviados a *Biblica*, de alguna manera relacionados con los estudios bíblicos. La mención de un título en este Elenco no implica por tanto juicio alguno acerca de la obra. El consejo de dirección determina qué libros serán recensionados en *Biblica*.

Los libros y fascículos que non han sido expresamente pedidos por *Biblica* no serán devueltos al remitente, aún cuando no parezca conveniente publicar una recensión sobre ellos.

Todos los libros y fascículos enviados a *Biblica* se trasmiten al Editor del *Elenchus of Biblical Bibliography*, y aparecen en él a juicio de dicho Editor.

Envíense los libros a: Dirección *Biblica*, Pontificio Istituto Biblico, Via della Pilotta 25, I-00187 Roma, Italia.

Vetus Testamentum

Barré, Lloyd M., *The Rhetoric of Political Persuasion*. The Narrative Artistry and Political Intentions of 2 Kings 9-11 (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 20). Washington, DC, The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1988. ix-161 p. 15,3 x 22,3. \$5.00.

Baumgartner, Walter, *Jeremiah's Poems of Lament* (Historic Texts and Interpreters in Biblical Scholarship). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1987. 114 p. 13,7 x 21,4. £17.50/\$29.95.

La Bible d'Alexandrie. Le Lévitique. Traduction du texte grec de la Septante. Introduction et notes par Paul **Harlé** et Didier **Pralon**. Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1988. 224 p. 14 x 20. 125 FF.

Boyce, Richard Nelson, *The Cry to God in the Old Testament* (SBL Dissertation Series 103). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1988. ix-93 p. 14 x 21,4. \$16.95.

Dearman, John Andrew, *Property Rights in the Eighth-Century Prophets* (SBL Dissertation Series 106). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. x-171 p. 13,9 x 21,4.

Florit, Josep Ribera, *El Targum de Isaías*. La Versión Aramea del Profeta Isaías (Biblioteca Midrásica 6). Valencia, Institución S. Jerónimo. 1988. 277 p. 16,2 x 24,1.

Gesenius, Wilhelm, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*. Hrsg. R. Meyer und H. Donner. 18. Auflage. 1. Lieferung Alef – Gimel. xxx-233 p. Berlin, Springer-Verlag, 1987. 28 × 20 DM 248,—.

Hagstrom, David Gerald, *The Coherence of the Book of Micah*. A Literary Analysis (SBL Dissertation Series 89). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. ix-152 p. 14 × 21,3. \$16.95.

Jeansonne, Sharon Pace, *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12* (The Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series 19). Washington, DC, The Catholic Biblical Association, 1988. 147 p. 15,3 × 22,3. \$5.00.

Klein, Lillian R., *The Triumph of Irony in the Book of Judges* (Bible and Literature Series 14). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1988. 260 p. 14,2 × 22. £25.00/\$42.50.

Koenig, Jean, *Oracles et liturgies de l'exil babylonien* (Etudes d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses 69). Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1988. 208 p. 15,5 × 24. 225 FF.

Michaud, Robert, *Ben Sira et le judaïsme*. La littérature de Sagesse. Histoire et théologie, III (Lire la Bible 82). Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1988. 216 p. 11,5 × 18.

Rofé, Alexander, *Introduction to Deuteronomy*. Part I and Further Chapters. Jerusalem, Akademon Publishing House, 1988. 325 p. 24 × 16,9.

Van Leeuwen, Raymond C., *Context and Meaning in Proverbs 25–27* (SBL Dissertation Series 96). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. xi-171 p. 13,9 × 21,4. \$14.95.

Novum Testamentum

Barclay, John, *Obedying the Truth*. A Study of Paul's Ethics in Galatians (Studies of the New Testament and its World Series). Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1988. xv-298 p. 14,3 × 22,3. £16.95.

Broer, Ingo – **Werblick**, Jürgen (Hrsg.), *„Der Herr ist wahrhaft auferstanden“ (Lk 24,34)*. Biblische und systematische Beiträge zur Entstehung des Osterglaubens (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien 134). Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988. 157 p. 13,5 × 20,7. DM 31,80.

Bruce, F. F., *The Book of the Acts*. Revised Edition (The New International Commentary on the New Testament). Grand Rapids, MI, Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1988. xxiii-541 p. 14,2 × 22. \$19.50.

Carroll, John T., *Response to the End of History*. Eschatology and Situation in Luke–Acts (SBL Dissertation Series 92). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1988. vii-208 p. 14 × 21,4. \$19.95.

Davies, W. D. – Allison, Dale, *The Gospel according to Saint Matthew*. Introduction and Commentary on Matthew I–VII, Volume 1 (The International Critical Commentary). Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark Ltd, 1988. XLVII-731 p. 13,7 × 21,2. £27.50.

Downing, F. Gerald, *Christ and the Cynics*. Jesus and other Radical Preachers in First-Century Tradition (JSOT Manuals 4). Sheffield, Sheffield Academic Press, 1988. XIII-232 p. 21,5 × 30.

Fitzgerald, John T., *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*. An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence (SBL Dissertation Series 99). Atlanta, Scholars Press, 1988. VII-289 p. 13,9 × 21,5. \$17.95.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A., *Paul and His Theology*. A Brief Sketch. Second Edition. Englewood Cliffs, Prentice Hall, 1989. XVIII-119 p. 15 × 22,7.

Keck, Leander E., *Paul and His Letters*. Second Edition, Revised and Enlarged (Proclamation Commentaries). Philadelphia, PA, Fortress Press, 1988. X-164 p. 14 × 21,5.

Kingsbury, Jack Dean, *Matthew as Story*. Second edition, revised and enlarged. Philadelphia, PA, Fortress Press, 1988. X-181 p. 15,2 × 22,8.

Kloppenborg, John S., *Q Parallels*. Synopsis, Critical Notes & Concordance. Sonoma, CA, Polebridge Press, 1988. XXXIII-249 p. 20,5 × 23,5.

Kogler, Franz, *Das Doppelgleichnis vom Senfkorn und vom Sauerteig in seiner traditionsgeschichtlichen Entwicklung* (Forschung zur Bibel 59). Würzburg, Echter Verlag, 1988. 292 p. 15,3 × 23,3. DM 39,—.

Krieg, Robert A., *Story-Shaped Christology*. The Role of Narratives in Identifying Jesus Christ. New York–Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press, 1988. VI-169 p. 13,5 × 20,2. \$8.95.

Louw, Johannes P., – Nida, Eugene A., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Based on Semantic Domains. United Bible Society. Volume 1: Introduction and Domains. New York, NY, United Bible Societies, 1988. XXV-843 p. 18 × 24,5.

Louw, Johannes P., – Nida, Eugene A., *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament*. Based on Semantic Domains. United Bible Society. Volume 2: Indices. New York, NY, United Bible Societies, 1988. IV-375 p. 18 × 24,5.

McGann, Diarmuid, *Journeying within Transcendence*. A Jungian Perspective on the Gospel of John. Mahwah, NJ, 1988. IV-217 p. 13,7 × 20,3. \$8.95.

Neirynck, Frans, *Duality in Mark*. Contributions to the Study of Marcan Redaction. Revised Edition with Supplementary Notes (BETL XXXI).

Leuven, University Press, 1988 – Leuven, Peeters, 1988. 252 p. 16 × 24,3. 1.200 BF.

Neiryck, Frans, *Q-Synopsis*. The Double Tradition Passages in Greek (Studiorum Novi Testamenti Auxilia XIII). Leuven, University Press – Leuven, Peeters, 1988. 63 p. 15,9 × 24. 240 BF.

Perkins, PHEME, *Reading the New Testament*. An Introduction. Second Edition. Mahwah, NJ, Paulist Press, 1988. vii-350 p. 15,2 × 22,8. \$7.95.

Ponsot, Hervé, *Une introduction à la lettre aux Romains* (Initiations). Paris, Le Cerf, 1988. 218 p. 13,5 × 21,5. 125 FF.

Sabbe, M., *L'Évangile selon Marc*. Tradition et rédaction. Nouvelle édition augmentée (BETL XXXIV). Leuven, University Press – Leuven, Peeters, 1988. 600 p. 16 × 24,3. 2.400 BF.

Schenke, Ludger, (Hrsg.), *Studien zum Matthäusevangelium*. Festschrift für Wilhelm Pesch (Stuttgarter Bibelstudien). Stuttgart, Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1988. 317 p. 13,5 × 20,7. DM 39,—.

Staley, Jeffrey Lloyd, *The Print's First Kiss: A Rhetorical Investigation of the Implied Reader in the Fourth Gospel*. (SBL Dissertation Series 82). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. vi-138 p. 13,9 × 21,4. \$16.95.

Stuhlhofer, Franz, *Symbol oder Realität? – Taufe und Abendmahl*. Berneck, Schwengeler-Verlag, 1988. 109 p. 11 × 18. DM 8,—.

Theobald, Michael, *Die Fleischwerdung des Logos* (Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen Neue Folge 20). Münster, Verlag Aschendorff, 1988. ix-537 p. 16 × 23,8. DM 148,—.

Vanni, Ugo, *L'Apocalisse*. Ermeneutica, esegesi, teologia (Supplementi alla Rivista Biblica 17). Bologna, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1988. 432 p. 16,5 × 23,9. Lit. 50.000.

Watson, Duane Frederick, *Invention, Arrangement, and Style*. Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter (SBL Dissertation Series 104). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. xii-214 p. 14 × 21,3. \$20.95.

Varia

Beall, Todd S., *Josephus' Description of the Essenes Illustrated by the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 58). Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1988. 200 p. 14,4 × 22,3. \$37.50.

Cothenet, Edouard, *Exégèse et Liturgie* (Lectio Divina 133). Paris, Les Editions du Cerf, 1988. 356 p. 13,5 × 21,5. 200 F.

Cusson, Gilles, S. J., *Biblical Theology and The Spiritual Exercises*. St. Louis, MO, The Institute of Jesuit Sources, 1988. xv-385 p. 15,8 × 23,5. \$24.00.

Danker, Frederick William, *A Century of Greco-Roman Philology*. Featuring the American Philological Association and the Society of Biblical Literature. Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. xvii-299 p. 15 × 22,7. \$26.95.

Denis, Albert-Marie, *Concordance grecque des pseudépigraphes d'Ancien Testament*. Concordance, Corpus des textes, Indices. Louvain-la-Neuve, Université Catholique de Louvain, 1988. xxi-925 p. 32,5 × 23. FB 7.500.

Drinkard, J. F., Jr. – Mattingly, G. L. – Miller, J. M. (eds.), *Benchmarks in Time and Culture*. Dedicated to Joseph A. Callaway (American Schools of Oriental Research and The Society of Biblical Literature Archaeology and Biblical Studies 1). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. xviii-487 p. 15,2 × 22,8. \$44.95.

Dundes, Alan, (ed.), *The Flood Myth*. Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 1988. vi-452 p. 15,1 × 22,8. \$48.00.

Frerichs, Ernest S. (ed.), *The Bible and Bibles in America* (Society of Biblical Literature Centennial Publications). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. ix-224 p. 15 × 23,5. \$18.95.

Giltner, John H., *Moses Stuart. The Father of Biblical Science in America* (Society of Biblical Literature Centennial Publications 14). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. viii-158 p. 15,2 × 22,8. \$19.95.

Grudem, Wayne, *The Gift of Prophecy in the New Testament and Today*. Eastbourne, Kingsway Publications, 1988. 351 p. 12,5 × 19,7. £7.95.

Herron, Thomas J., *The Dating of the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians: The Theological Basis of the Majoral View*. Rome, 1988. viii-151 p. 16,8 × 24.

Lamau, Marie-Louise, *Des chrétiens dans le monde*. Communautés pétriennes au 1^{er} siècle (Lectio Divina 134). Paris, le Cerf, 1988. 379 p. 13,5 × 21,5. 150 FF.

Leone, Aurora, *Gli animali da trasporto nell'Egitto greco, romano e bizantino* (Papyrologica Castroctaviana 12). Roma, Pontificio Istituto Biblico – Barcelona, Seminario de Papirologia, 1988. 102 p. 16 × 21,5. Lit. 19,500.

Malherbe, A. J., *Ancient Epistolary Theorists* (SBL Sources for Biblical Study 19). Atlanta, GA, Scholars Press, 1988. vii-88 p. 22,8 × 15,4. \$16.95.

Morgan, Robert – Barton, John, *Biblical Interpretation* (The Oxford Bible Series). Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1988. ix-342 p. 12,7 × 20.

Mulder, Martin Jan (ed.), *Mikra. Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (Compendium Rerum Iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum II,1). Assen/Maastricht, Van Gorcum, 1988. xxvi-929 p. 16 × 24,2.

Pasquetto, Virgilio, *Mai più schiavi! Aspetti religiosi e sociali del concetto biblico di liberazione*. Napoli, Edizioni Dehoniane, 1988. 528 p. 20,9 × 13,9. Lit. 30.000.

Santangelo, Maria N., *Le Berceau des Anges*. Leuven-Paris, Peeters, 1988. 220 p. 16 × 24. 1.200 FB.

Schall, Anton, *Elementa Arabica*. Einführung in die klassische arabische Sprache. Wiesbaden, Otto Harrassowitz, 1988. viii-209 p. 17 × 24. DM 48,—.

Verreet, E., *Modi Ugaritici*. Eine morpho-syntaktische Abhandlung über das Modalsystem im Ugaritischen (Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 27). Leuven, Peeters, 1988. xxx-264 p. 16,3 × 24,5. 2.950 FB.

ISSN 0006-0887

PIETRO BOCCACCIO, Direttore Responsabile

Autorizz. Tribunale di Roma n. 6229 del 24-3-1958 del Reg. della Stampa

TIPOGRAFIA POLIGLOTTA DELLA PONTIFICIA UNIVERSITÀ GREGORIANA
PIAZZA DELLA PILOTTA, 4 - ROMA